DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 532 CS 003 089

AUTHOR McBride, Richard; Perrante, Reynolds
TITLE A Literature Search to Determine the Degree of Support for the Alabama Right to Read Criteria for Success.
INSTITUTION Alabama State Dept. of Education, Montgomery.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Right to Read Program.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 97p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Literature Reviews; *Program Improvement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; *Reading Research; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS Alabama; *Right to Read

ABSTRACT

A literature search was undertaken to determine the degree of support for the 26 criteria for successful reading programs developed by the Alabama Right-to-Read program. The report includes a brief history of the development of the criteria, a description of the search process, samples of supported criteria, and a discussion of findings. The search supported a majority of the criteria. Of this majority, most were supported by expert opinion rather than by research. Criteria in the areas of program administration and organization received the least support, while criteria related to staffing, instruction, and materials and supplies had an abundance of support. Research items located by the search indicate a need for a more systematic, organized approach to research in reading. (Author/AA)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED132532

A LITERATURE SEARCH TO DETERMINE THE DEGREE OF SUPPORT FOR THE ALABAMA RIGHT TO READ CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS

Richard McBride
Right to Read Director
1973-74 Project Year

Reynolds Ferrante
Educational Consultant
Consulting Services to Education
Catonsville, Maryland

Janet N. Bacon
Publications Consultant
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

AS 003 089

CONTENTS

Abstract		iv
Preface	*Richard McBride & Reynolds Ferrante*	v
I. Development of the Alabama Right to Read Criteria for Success		1
History of Alabama as a Right to Read State		1
Development of the Criteria for Success		2
Alabama Right to Read Program Criteria for Success		5
II. Literature Search to Provide Support for the Criteria for Success		8
Rationale for the Literature Search		8
The Literature Search Process		8
1. What is an Educational Information Center?		8
2. What is Project RISE?		9
3. What Service Does RISE Provide?		10
4. What are the RISE Information Resources?		10
5. What is a RISE Literature Search?		11
6. What Kind of Searches Can Be Made?		11
How Do I Set Up a Search at an Information Center Such as RISE?		12
1. Determine Your Subject Specifically, in Phrase Form if Possible?		12
2. Determine Your Major Key Words (Descriptors)		12
3. Conduct the Search		12
4. Analyze the Results		13
The Search to Support the Criteria for Success		13
III. Exemplary Supported Criteria		15
Criterion IB 6: Organization and Administration/Staff/ LEA Reading Director		15
The Criterion: LEA Director of All Reading Activities		15
Key Words		15
Discussion		15
Items in Support of Criterion IB 6		16
Criterion II 2: Instruction/Individualized		17
Criterion III 1: Facilities and Materials/Supplementary/ Supplementary Reading Materials		20
IV. Discussion of the Results of the Literature Search		23
Criteria Supported by the Search		23
Nature of the Support for the Criteria		23
Limitations of the Search Process		24
Implications of the Search for Reading Research and Reading Programs		25

Appendix A: The Literature Review in Support of the Criteria for a Successful Reading Program 27

Appendix B: Alphabetical Listing of the Literature 82

Appendix C: Alabama Right to Read Phase I School Systems 91

ABSTRACT

During its 1973-74 project year, the Alabama Right to Read program directors and supporting groups in the state developed 26 criteria for success, which were to be used as a statewide standard for program development. This monograph reports the results of a literature search to determine if the criteria were or were not supported by recent empirical and/or theoretical findings.

The monograph gives (1) a brief history of the development of the criteria, (2) a description of the search process, (3) samples of exemplary supported criteria, and (4) a discussion of the findings of the search. The total search results are located in Appendix A, followed by an alphabetical listing of the items found in the search in Appendix B.

The search supported a majority of the criteria. Of these, slightly more than half were highly supported. The remaining criteria were supported: (1) by inference from other educational programs or practices or criteria, (2) in a slightly different form than stated, or (3) by a small amount of literature. Of the criteria supported, the majority were supported by expert opinion rather than research. Criteria in the areas of program administration and organization received the least support, while staffing, instruction, and materials and supplies seemed to have an abundance of support. It is suggested, due to the limitations of the search, that a further search be conducted for some of the criteria before definite conclusions are drawn. The research items located in the search indicate the need for a more systematic, organized method of approaching research in reading.

PREFACE

This monograph reports on a first for the Alabama educational effort: a national search of the literature to determine empirical and/or theoretical support for the criteria set up by the local R2R directors and other supporting groups in the state. This effort and its companion effort, a Delphi study of all key educators involved in the R2R effort to determine their degree of consensus about the criteria, will comprise a two monograph set reporting on the results of each of these efforts.

These two monographs would never have been possible without the efforts of all educational personnel in Alabama who were associated with the R2R effort. We owe them a great debt of gratitude for their cooperation in developing the criteria. We also owe a debt of gratitude to the current R2R director, Dr. John Shelton, who has seen fit to support the development of this monograph and the Delphi study monograph into the 1974-75 project year.

The literature search reported in this publication was carried out and analyzed by Browning and Mary Spence, two doctoral students at The Pennsylvania State University. They are primarily responsible for the results presented here in Appendix A. They did an exceptionally fine search for us given the time and money constraints within the project, both in gathering and analyzing the items for each criteria.

We trust that the results reported here will provide support for the Alabama R2R effort as it moves toward its goal of increased reading competency for the state of Alabama.

Richard McBride
Project Director,
Right to Read
1973-1974

Reynolds Ferrante
Educational Consultant

I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALABAMA RIGHT TO READ CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS

History of Alabama as a Right to Read State

Prior to 1973, only 11 states had been officially designated as Right to Read states, a designation that requires the signing of an agreement with the U.S. Office of Education. Alabama agreed to the commitments and was officially acknowledged as a Right to Read state in March 1973. Dr. Ruth Love Holloway, national director of Right to Read, visited Alabama to address the first meeting of the state advisory commission and notified the state of its acceptance.

Upon its acceptance, Alabama was given a basic grant of $50,000 to establish a formal organization. On July 1, 1973, the Alabama Right to Read program had its official beginning with the employment of a program administrator. Governor George C. Wallace gave the program $50,000 in revenue sharing funds as a supplement to the basic grant. These monies were used to employ staff personnel.

Since Right to Read is a program whose purpose is to coordinate existing reading functions by building comprehensive reading programs through the skills and competencies developed by staff training, the participating school receives no monies for personnel or materials. For this reason, Alabama applied for and received an additional grant of $62,000 to train at least one reading director in every school system in the state. These highly skilled directors were to return to their local school districts to organize comprehensive reading programs, including the transfer of their training directly to all administrators,

teachers, and support personnel through a program of local staff development.

Upon the official inauguration of Right to Read in Alabama on July 1, 1973, and in view of the commitment to organize a training program for local directors, plans were immediately initiated. In the short span of five weeks, the Right to Read staff organized a staff development training workshop which was begun on August 6, 1973, at Auburn University. Twenty days of the mandated 30 days or 240 hours of instruction were conducted during the period August 6-31. The remaining 10 days of training were conducted during the 1973-74 school year.

The training of the directors was both extensive and intensive in six broad curricular areas: (1) reading methods, (2) reading program development, (3) change agent and communication skills, (4) development of instructional materials, (5) knowledge of commercial materials, and (6) knowledge of the state department of education. One major thrust of the training was program planning and development skills necessary to build a comprehensive reading program and the administrative and management skills to make it function effectively. The instruction was conducted by outstanding educators on the state and national level.

Development of the Criteria for Success

During the training period in October 1973, the Right to Read directors addressed themselves to the identification of standards for a successful reading program. From the session, 34 criteria were identified. These were to form a set of statewide standards to be implemented and refined as necessary. In order to obtain additional reactions and input, the criteria were submitted to key individuals and

groups of educators within the state. Responses were obtained from 152 educators at all levels in the 14 participating school systems. The members of the state Right to Read advisory commission and the state department of education R2R task force also responded to the criteria. From all of the responses, 26 criteria finally resulted. Following all of these contributions, a technical writing team put the criteria into final form. These were submitted for approval to the 14 R2R directors at a later training session. Upon the recommendations of the R2R directors, the advisory commission and the task force officially adopted the criteria as the basis for program development during the 1973-74 school year in the participating school systems (see Appendix C).

The total developmental process, which took two months, can be schematized as follows:

17-19 OCT	Develop Initial 34 Criteria First increment to summer training workshop for R2R LEA directors. Brainstorming to develop original 34 criteria.
	Obtain Local Educator Feedback R2R reading directors survey a sample of local educators to modify the criteria on the basis of their input.
31 OCT	Refine Criteria on the Basis of Feedback LEA R2R coordinators report results of survey. Criteria reduced to 26.
5 NOV	Request SDE and Advisory Committee to Further Refine Criteria 26 criteria presented to SDE task force for analysis. Statewide R2R advisory committee refine criteria.
12-13 NOV	Write Criteria in Final Form Technical writing team put criteria into final form.
	Adopt Criteria Formally at State Level
9 JAN	R2R advisory committee adopt criteria.
14 JAN	SDE task force adopt 26 criteria.

The final 26 criteria are listed on the following pages. They comprise three categories: (1) organization and administration: program and staff, (2) instruction, and (3) facilities and materials.

ALABAMA RIGHT TO READ PROGRAM
CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Program

1. Scope and Sequence of Learnings.

   Each local education agency teacher of reading uses a scope and sequence of learnings designed to insure the acquisition of reading skills.

2. Coordination and Articulation of All Special Reading Programs with the Basic Curriculum.

   There is coordination and articulation between all federally funded, volunteer, and other reading and language arts programs and the basic reading curriculum.

3. Individual Student Record-Keeping System.

   A continuous record-keeping system of reading progress is maintained for each individual student.

4. Coordination with Pre-school Program.

   The local education agency works cooperatively with existing pre-school components to coordinate and articulate reading programs.

5. Adult Basic Education Reading Component.

   The local education agency has an adult basic education reading component.

6. Continuous Reading Program

   The local education agency has a continuous educational program which includes provision for summer instruction in reading.

7. Incentives for Staff Development.

   The board of education of the local education agency has an incentive program for teacher staff development in reading.

8. Media Center.

   Each school in the local education agency has a media center which is operated on an open basis and is readily accessible to students and teachers.

9. Testing System.

   The local education agency has a complete testing system

which includes the use of criterion-referenced measures.

B. Staff

1. Variation of Student-Teacher Ratios as Necessary.

The local education agency varies the student-teacher ratios as necessary to meet the objectives of the reading instructional program.

2. Continuous Staff Development.

The local education agency has a continuous staff development program in reading for all teachers, administrators, and supportive personnel.

3. Training of Content Area Teachers.

The local education agency provides training to teachers in the content areas to develop competencies which will allow them to adjust instruction to the varying reading achievement levels of their students.

4. Trained Volunteer Helpers.

The local education agency has trained volunteer helpers in reading instruction.

5. Media Center.

Each school in the local education agency has a media center which is staffed by professional and supportive personnel.

6. LEA Director of All Reading Activities.

The local education agency has a director of all reading activities who has the authority, responsibility, and time granted by the superintendent and board of education to organize, implement, and coordinate a comprehensive reading program.

C. Community Relations

1. Report to the Parents.

Each local education agency has a reporting system that fully, accurately, and specifically communicates a student's progress in reading to parents.

2. Report to the Community.

The local education agency introduces, explains, and periodically reports the reading program to the school community.

3. Sharing of Instructional Methods.

The local education agency shows willingness to share instructional methods and materials which have proved effective in reading programs.

II. INSTRUCTION

1. Junior-Senior High Teacher Knowledge of Developmental Reading.

Teachers of reading at the junior and senior high school levels have a demonstrated knowledge of developmental reading as it relates to the reading curriculum of the local education agency.

2. Individualized Instruction.

Provisions are made for teaching every student at his own instructional level and learning rate.

3. Positive Environment.

The teaching-learning environment is conducive to the development of positive attitudes toward reading.

4. Teacher Use of Various Reading Methods and Techniques.

Every teacher demonstrates a knowledge of various methods and techniques used in the teaching of reading to make provision for the differences that exist among students.

III. FACILITIES AND MATERIALS

1. Supplementary Reading Materials.

Appropriate supplementary reading materials to support the basic reading curriculum are provided and utilized.

2. Materials Recognize Variations in Race, Culture, Sex.

Materials are utilized which recognize different races, cultures and sexes.

3. Supportive Media.

A wide variety of supportive media on all levels of learning is available and readily accessible.

4. Central Location for Reading Materials.

Instructional and practice reading materials are filed in a central location in each school for use by all teachers as needed.

II. LITERATURE SEARCH TO PROVIDE SUPPORT FOR THE CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS

Rationale for the Literature Search

Research on organizational behavior and experiences of state departments of education have shown that the success of any organization rests on clearly stated objectives and on commitment from the top down through the organization to those objectives. The state R2R directors and the state level administrators had done as complete a job as they could in determining the objectives of the R2R program for Alabama. They had arrived at their criteria based on their own experience in education. Now they wished to know what support, if any, the educational literature gave to the 26 criteria. The standard procedure for such a literature search in education is to use the information centers that have been developed nationally to meet needs for information such as this.

The Literature Search Process

1. *What Is an Educational Information Center?*

Education professionals produce thousands of pieces of literature each year. Most of these (90%) are what we call "fugitive." While this term, as applied to a literature, actually means that the material is of passing interest (as opposed to lasting for generations), one might not be too far wrong to think that the literature is fugitive because it is hard to find. Precisely because the literature is of passing interest, it is not produced regularly and cannot be anticipated by those who would wish to use it

nationally. In order to make it available to groups other than the producer and those to whom he disseminates it, organizations have been formed by educational practitioners to store, retrieve, and disseminate such literature. These information centers, sometimes called clearinghouses, usually have a computerized system with a data base built from major educational bibliographic sources, including indexes; journals; products of regional educational labs; selected curriculum materials; ESEA program reports; and other informational agencies, such as ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center), a major information center with 16 clearinghouses throughout the country. ERIC is one of the major sources for collecting, storing, and retrieving the literature of education. Through its auspices, a dictionary of descriptors used to file (and retrieve) information was developed and is in use throughout the country. Many educational practitioners, including those in universities make frequent use of these clearinghouse services. Thus, through The Pennsylvania State University, a literature search was made through RISE (Research and Information Services for Education) located at King of Prussia, Pa.

2. *What is Project RISE?*

Project RISE is essentially an educational information center devoted to providing educational decision-makers with relevant information drawn from national, state, regional, and local resources in support of their problems and concerns.

The project operates under the joint sponsorship of the Montgomery County Intermediate Unit and Bureau of Planning and Evaluation of the Pennsylvania Department of Education. It is

currently engaged in the establishment of a statewide educational information network.

3. *What Services Does RISE Provide?*

- Preparation and dissemination of research information reports (reviews of literature)
- Assistance in program development and evaluation
- Ready reference services
- Training and dissemination activities and information services
- Publication program including occasional papers, bibliographies, special reports and state-of-the-art papers on specific topics
- Computer and manual information retrieval from such national resources as the ERIC collection
- Dissemination of ESEA Title III activities
- Dissemination of other state sponsored R & D activity results such as those of the Educational Development Centers
- Dissemination of selected curriculum materials such as Learning Activity Packages.

4. *What Are The RISE Information Resources?*

Pennsylvania Title III program reports

Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)

300 current educational journals

Selected Curriculum Materials

Products of the Regional Educational Labs

National index services

ERIC Clearinghouses

Cooperative agreements with other informational agencies such as Educational Testing Service and Educational Research Service

5. *What is a RISE Literature Search?*

Perhaps the most important--and certainly the most visible--service is the preparation and dissemination of research information reports, that is, the end product of a literature search. Each search and each resulting report is individually tailored to the specific question asked by a specific client on a specific topic. It is thus in every sense a responsive service, geared to the client's needs. Trained searchers receive a search request, negotiate with the client to precisely define his requirements, and then undertake a search of all available resources to locate and retrieve material bearing directly on the question at issue. The result is a package of knowledge in the form of article or book print-outs, bibliographies, abstracts, research studies, exemplary projects, and other material. Searches may deal with, for instance, the structure of the middle school or the ungraded school or school student activism; the task is to come up with pertinent and reliable data concerning any question asked about any legitimate educational concern. The search process can be either manual or computer or both. Other forms of information dissemination include ready reference, selected dissemination packages, and duplicates of original searches. RISE prefers to provide its products in microfiche format but hard copy is available at higher cost.

6. *What Kind of Searches Can be Made?*

. Single concepts, such as . . . Mathematics Education

. Combinations of concepts, such as . . . Mathematics Education combined with Secondary Education combined with Computers

. Combinations of combinations, such as . . . Mathematics Education or Mathematics Instruction combined with Secondary Education or High Schools combined with Computers or Computer-Aided Instruction

. Or nearly anything you want.

How Do I Set Up a Search at an Information Center Such as RISE?

1. *Determine your Subject Specifically, i.e. Phrase Form if Possible.*

   e.g. The Legal Rights of Untenured Teachers.

2. *Determine Your Major Key Words (Descriptors).*

   For this step you would use an alphabetical list of key words which comprise the information center's data base to find those that correspond to yours. This is the critical step and it involves some hit-and-miss, just as looking up something in the yellow pages of the phone book often does. If you don't find the right descriptors you cannot retrieve the information. Using the example above we would derive the following descriptors (5 to 10 is an optimal number):

   Administrative Policy

   Educational Legislation

   Teacher Employment

   Tenure

   State Legislation

3. *Conduct the Search.*

   These five descriptors would be transmitted to the computer data base or be used manually with an index of abstracts that has entries listed by subject. The computer would print out (for a fee) those

abstracts desired ; the index abstracts refer you to microfiche which contains the entire article, should you wish to see it. For journal articles not abstracted you must go to the journal. For the example above a pertinent list of items would be:

a. "The Legal Rights of Untenured Teachers"

b. "The Teacher and Due Process"

c. "Teacher Tenure: What Does it Mean?"

d. "The Teacher's Day in Court: Review of 1970. An Annual Compilation"

e. "The Impact of 1961 Legislation Relating to Probationary Teachers on Instruction and Administrative Practices in California Public Junior Colleges."

4. *Analyze the Results*

Read the abstracts and articles to find the type of information you need to answer whatever questions you might have about the topic in question.

The Search to Support the Criteria for Success

The search process just described was modified for the purposes of the Alabama R2R program search. Because the 26 criteria were interrelated and ranged from very broad to very narrow concepts, a search using the total number of descriptors which would have resulted by making a list for each criterion would have proved unwieldy and far beyond the budget of the program; therefore, it was decided to review the results of 40 recent reading searches already on file at RISE. These searches ranged over a full gamut of topics of current national interest in reading, such as individualized instruction, preschool programs, and new teaching techniques.

The searches include, as was mentioned in the section describing

the basic process, abstracts, journal articles, research studies, exemplary projects (program descriptions), consultant resources, and bibliographies. Using a list of key words, the searchers were able to find articles and abstracts from these sources and to locate other articles and abstracts listed on bibliographies in the packets. Their search yielded 99 usable references in support of the criteria. All of these are listed in Appendix A of this report along with the criterion they support. Appendix B contains an alphabetical list of the 99 references. The next section will present three of the supported criteria, one from each of the three sections of the criteria (organization and administration, instruction, and facilities and materials) indicating key words (descriptors) applicable to the search, a discussion of the items as they support the criterion, and a list of the items in support of the given criterion.

III. EXEMPLARY SUPPORTED CRITERIA

Criterion 1B 6: Organization and Administration/Staff/LEA Reading Director

LEA Director of All Reading Activities.

The local education agency has a director of all reading activities who has the authority, responsibility, and time granted by the superintendent and board of education to organize, implement, and coordinate a comprehensive reading program.

Key Words:

Reading Program

Comprehensive
Personnel
Director

Specialist

Coordinator

Resource Teacher

School District Organization

Discussion

The literature reviewed for this criterion, while not extensive, stressed the necessity of a designated professional who is provided the time and authority to coordinate the reading program for the district. The duties of the director (also called coordinator, specialist) will necessitate close working relationships with both the school reading teacher and other classroom teachers.

Kipling states that every administrative district should provide a reading coordinator to supervise all reading programs who should have the time to teach, supervise reading labs, and conduct in-service programs.

McNeil suggests that the coordinator must concentrate on working with teachers rather than students to best utilize the coordinator's expertise. The reading coordinator has to be full-time to relate reading programs to other special programs (such as speech) as well as the general school program.

Herber suggests that one of the reasons for the success of the Norfolk experimental reading program was the availability of a full-time coordinator to work with the reading coordinator in each school.

Items in Support of Criterion IB 6

The number in parentheses before each entry is the number of the entry in the total bibliography. The ED numbers are the file numbers of the item in the ERIC system.

(50) Herber, Harold L. "Reading in Content Areas: A District Develops Its Own Personnel." Journal of Reading (May 1970): 587-92.

(56) "How Does Your Remedial Reading Stack Up?" NJEA Review (March 1970): 16-19.

(59) Kipling, Cecil. "An Optimum Reading Program for Grades K-12, and School District Organization." South Dakota University, November 1, 1967. ED 018 341.

(68) McNeil, Shirley. "The Role of the Reading Coordinator." Great Cities School Improvement Program, Detroit, Michigan, February 1965. ED 001 005.

(90) Smith, Richard J. "The Role of Reading Resource Teacher." Paper presented at the International Reading Association Conference, May 6-9, 1970. ED 042 578.

Criterion II 2: Instruction/Individualized

Individualized Instruction

Provisions are made for teaching every student at his own instructional level and learning rate.

Key Words

Reading Program

Teaching Methods
Techniques

Reading Instruction

Diagnostic
Individualized

Individualized Instruction

Learning
Reading

Nongradedness

Discussion

Because of the difficulty in defining and operationalizing "teaching every student at his own instructional level," definitive research was difficult to locate; but there is overwhelming evidence that this is considered as a major criterion for most successful programs (Cotter, Robinson, Karlin, Lichtman).

Several studies claim that individualizing instruction is fulfilled by nongraded schools and most of the studies reviewed demonstrated gains in achievement through nongradedness (Brown, Otto, Gumpper, Anderson, Beck, Wilt, Engel and Cooper, Hilson, Remacle, Lewis).

Other ways of individualizing instruction include the use of individually prescribed instruction (IPI) [Beck, Derenzis], diagnostically structured programs (Klasterman), and remedial reading

programs (Warterberg, Crawford and Conley).

Many authors state that individualizing instruction is essential to a good reading program and proceed to give suggestions for teaching every student at his own instructional level (Newman, Blakely and McKay).

Items Supporting Criterion II 2:

(2) Anderson, Richard C. "The Case for Nongraded Homogeneous Grouping." The Elementary School Journal (January 1962): 193-197.

(5) Artley, A. Sterl. "Trends and Practice in Secondary School Reading: A Report on Recent Research." ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, 1968. ED 024 560.

(7) Beck, Isabel L. and Bolvin, John O. "A Model for Nongradedness: The Reading Program for Individually Prescribed Instruction." Pittsburgh University Learning Research and Development Center, 1969. ED 033 832.

(12) Blakely, W. Paul and McKay, Beverly. "Individualized Reading as Part of an Eclectic Reading Program." Elementary English (March 1966): 214-19.

(17) Brown, Edward K. "The Nongraded Program at the Powell Elementary School: Evaluative Phase II." Philadelphia School District, Pennsylvania, April 1970. ED 049 298.

(23) Cotter, Katharine. "First-Grade Failure: Diagnosis, Treatment and Prevention." Childhood Education (November 1967): 172-76.

(25) Crawford, Gail and Conley, Dick. "Meet You in Reading Lab!" Journal of Reading (October 1971): 16-21

(26) Derenzis, Joseph J. "Individually Prescribed Instruction: Background Information and Research." Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, April 19-23, 1971. ED 051 974.

(31) Engel, Barney M. and Cooper, Martin. "Academic Achievement and Nongradedness." The Journal of Experimental Education 40 (Winter 1971).

(46) Gumpper. Nongraded Elementary Education: Individualized Learning, Teacher Leadership, Student Responsibility. University Park: Institute for Research on Human Resources, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971. ED 057 440.

(53) Hillson, Maurice; Jones, J. Charles; Moore, J. William; and Van Devender, Frank. "A Controlled Experiment Evaluating the Effects of a Nongraded Organization on Pupil Achievement." The Journal of Educational Research 57 (July-August 1964): 548-50.

(58) Karlin, Robert. "Characteristics of Sound Remedial Reading Instruction." Journal of the Reading Specialists (May 1966): 165-69.

(60) Klosterman, Sister Rita. "The Effectiveness of a Diagnostically Structured Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (November 1970): 159-67.

(64) Lewis, Ruth Christine. "A Study of the Results of the Brandonville Project in Nongraded Instruction." Dissertation Abstracts International 31 (June 1971): 6472A.

(65) Lichtman, Marilyn. "Keys to a Successful Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (April 1971): 652-58.

(77) Newman, Robert E. "The Individualized Approach to Reading Instruction--Key Concepts." May 1967. ED 017 396.

(79) Otto, Henry J. and others. "Nongradedness: An Elementary School Evaluation." Bureau of Laboratory Schools Monograph, No. 21, Texas University, 1969. ED 036 889.

(83) Remacle, Leo. "A Comparative Study of the Differences in Attitudes, Self-Concept, and Achievement of Children in Graded and Nongraded Elementary Schools." Dissertation Abstracts International 31 (May 1971): 5948-A.

(86) Robinson, R. E. "First-Grade Reading Instruction." The Asheville City Schools, 1965-1966. ED 010 171.

(88) Smith, George. "The Development of an Instrument to Record the Interaction Between Teacher and Pupil in the Classroom and the Correlation of Certain Factors with Achievement." Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971.

(97) Warterberg, Herbert; Hancley, Lilyan; and Locke, Maurice. "Developing a Full-time Reading Center Within a Public School Setting." The Reading Teacher 24 (March 1971): 532-36; 560.

(98) Wilt, Hiram Jack. "A Comparison of Student Attitudes Toward School, Academic Achievement, Integral Structures and Procedures: The Nongraded School vs. the Graded School." Dissertation Abstracts International. 31 (April 1971): 5105-A.

Criterion III 1: Facilities and Materials/Supplementary Reading Materials

Supplementary Reading Materials

Appropriate supplementary reading materials to support the basic reading curriculum are provided and utilized.

Key Words

Curriculum, Reading

Basic
Materials, Instructional

Supplementary Materials
Self-directed Materials
Media Center
Reading Lab
Programmed

Discussion

The use of appropriate supplementary reading materials to support the basic reading curriculum was supported by the literature reviewed.

While the results concerning the increase in reading achievement that can be attributed to the use of supplementary materials varied, several conclusions can be drawn: (1) The use of supplementary materials enabled the teacher to better meet the individual needs of each child (Lichtman, Blakely and McKay, Fay); (2) Supplementary materials help to establish a positive attitude toward learning to read, an essential characteristic in any reading program (Calder, Anderson, Fader, Fay); (3) The supplementary materials need to be chosen by the teacher or generated by the school to best meet the needs of the students (Stanchfield, Fay, Fader); (4) The supplementary materials should reflect the students' ethnic background and interests (Stanchfield); (5) Supplementary

materials should be utilized for students at all learning levels including the slow learner and the gifted (Bigaj, Quackenbush).

Results in student achievement varied when the attempt was made to link student achievement to the use of supplementary materials. Both Calder and Levine report that no significant difference in reading achievement was found with groups reporting the use of supplementary materials. Calder, however, stressed that there was a significant change in student attitudes toward reading, a change that could reflect increase in reading achievement if measured after several years. Stanchfield and Robinson each reported on a study that tested control groups versus experimental groups using supplementary materials. Both studies found that the experimental groups using the supplementary materials showed greater increases in reading achievement than did the control groups.

Items Supporting Criterion III 1:

(1) Anderson, Jean M. "The Impact of Seven Word Games on the Sight Vocabulary Retention of First Grade Students." Dissertation Abstracts International (1971): 4478-A.

(11) Bigaj, James J. "A Reading Program for Gifted Children in the Primary Grades." April 25, 1968. ED 020 086.

(12) Blakely, W. Paul and McKay, Beverly. "Individualized Reading as Part of an Eclectic Reading Program." Elementary English (March 1966): 214-19.

(16) Briscoe, Cecil D. "A Reading Program with Lay Aides and Programmed Material." The Clearinghouse (February 1969): 373-77.

(20) Calder, Clarence, Jr. "Self-directed Reading Materials." The Reading Teacher 21 (December 1967): 294-52.

(25) Crawford, Gail and Conley, Dick. "Meet You in Reading Lab!" Journal of Reading (October 1971): 16-21.

(30) Ellison, Mary Lou. "Compendium of Reading Materials and Teaching Techniques for the Wisconsin Prototypic System of Reading Instruction." Wisconsin University, February 1969. ED 039 105.

(33) Fader, Daniel N. "English for Reluctant Learners, Grades 7-9, English in Every Classroom." University of Michigan, October 1966. ED 010 424.

(37) Fay, Leo C. and others. "Curriculum Guide in Reading. Developmental Reading, Grades 1-8." Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, 1966. ED 011 495.

(62) Levine, Daniel A. and others. "Report of the Westside Workshop on Teacher Training and Curriculum Adaptation in the Inner City. An Institute to Help Teachers Develop and Adapt Instructional Materials. . ." October 1967. ED 024 734.

(65) Lichtman, Marilyn. "Keys to a Successful Reading Program." The Reading Teacher. 24 (April 1971): 652-58.

(79) Otto, Henry J. and others. "Nongradedness: An Elementary School Evaluation." Bureau of Laboratory Schools Monograph No. 21, Texas University, 1969. ED 036 889.

(81) Quackenbush, Sylvia. "Creative Reading Activities for the Middle Grades." Paper presented at the conference of the International Reading Association, May 6-9, 1970. ED 045 312.

(86) Robinson, R. E. "First-Grade Reading Instruction." The Asheville City Schools, 1965-1966. ED 010 171.

(91) Stanchfield, Jo. M. "The Use of Original Instructional Materials as a Stimulus for Improved Reading." December 1966. ED 013 731.

(92) Stowe, Elaine. "A Departmentalized High School Reading Program." 1971. ED 055 750.

IV. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS OF THE LITERATURE SEARCH

The major purpose of the review of the literature presented in this paper was to determine whether each criterion for success had empirical and/or theoretical support in the literature. The full report on each of the criteria is found in Appendix A. This section will summarize the results of the search as they support the criteria. Next it will discuss the nature of that support. Then it will make some evaluation of the search process itself. Finally, the section will discuss the implications of the search results for reading research and reading programs.

Criteria Supported by the Search

A majority of the criteria were supported by the search. Of these, slightly more than half were highly supported (IA 1,3,8,9; IB 1,2,3,5,6; IC 2; II 1,2,4; III 1,3). Of the remaining criteria, support is (a) derived by inference from other educational programs or practices or criteria (IA 4,7,9; IC 1; II 2; III 2,3); (b) in a slightly different form than stated (IB 4; helpers should be paid not volunteer); or (c) from a small amount of literature (IA 2,5,6; IB 5; IC 3; III 2,4). Some criteria are included in more than one category where appropriate.

The least support was found for criteria in the areas of program organization and administration while staffing, instruction, and material utilization seemed to have an abundance of support.

Nature of The Support for the Criteria

The majority of support for the criteria comes from expert opinion

rather than from research. Most studies that measure the success of a reading program do not isolate specific variables for research investigation, but attribute success to a combination of elements of a reading program. Because of this approach, some of the criteria had little conclusive support, while others were mutually supportive of each other. One of the most striking results was the lack of research in the area of program organization and administration. This may be due to the probable difficulty of organizing, controlling, and executing such studies as compared to investigation of a classroom teaching method or use of materials. The amount of time involved, along with recent focus on the need for long-range planning versus short range practical applications, may be factors contributing to this lack. Several explanations may be offered, including lack of funding for such projects, but the implication seems to be that the structure for learning has not been considered as important as the process for learning.

Limitations of the Search Process

The purpose of this search was to attempt to obtain a representative sample of the literature related to the criteria. The sources consulted seem to allow for an adequate survey in many of the areas; however, several of the criteria could not be supported either because of a lack of research conducted in those areas or because of the limitations of this research base. A further investigation of the literature should be conducted in the following areas before any conclusions are drawn:

1. Coordination between the reading program and other related programs (federally funded, volunteer, language arts, preschool, summer programs and adult education; Criteria IA 2,4,5,6).

2. Incentive programs for teachers (IA 7).

3. Utilization of the Media Center (IA 6, IB 5).

4. IC 1 community relations.

Investigation of the literature in the more general areas of pupil learning beyond the field of reading may provide some of the needed support. Other specific recommendations are included in the summarization of the research for each criterion.

Implications of the Search for Reading Research and Reading Programs

One of the major conclusions of this literature search is the need for a more organized, systematic method of approaching research in reading. This conclusion is supported by Moore, who stresses "What is necessary now is not the identification of new categories or the addition of innovative new questions, but the overriding need. . . . for better coordination of present efforts as well as an attack in new directions on the questions consistently raised, but not satisfactorily answered."

The research available suggests that reading is still in the developmental stage with no one theory or set of theories guiding research and/or practice. The concept of nongradedness as related to individualized instruction and gains in achievement (with all of their attendant implications for curriculum, materials, instructional methods, and teacher preparation) is now holding force (cf. IA 1,3,8,9; IC 1; IB 2,3,4,5,6; II 1,3,4; III 1,3) but is not itself a theoretical base. At the present, adequate teacher preparation seems to be sorely lacking; in-service programs are poor; many items are supported by expert opinion and by practice but are not being widely practiced. The

channels of communication between experts and classroom teachers are presently inadequate. All in all, much work and effort by both reading practitioners and researchers is required if reading in the U.S. may move toward the goal of improved reading supported by the national and local R2R programs.

APPENDIX A:

The Literature Review in Support of
The Criteria for A Successful
Reading Program

The number in parentheses before each entry is the number of the entry in the total bibliography. The ED numbers are the file numbers of the item in the ERIC system.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Program

1. *Scope and Sequence of Learnings.*

Each local education agency teacher of reading uses a scope and sequence of learnings designed to insure the acquisition of reading skills.

The literature reviewed gave overwhelming support to this criterion, but no specific research examined this issue alone as the reason for achievement in reading. It is considered as an essential element of a successful reading program in several articles (Otto, Lichtman, Karlin, Artley, Hodder, Fay).

When it was used the scope and sequence was achieved through behavioral objectives (Rentel 1967). Buchanan (1971) indicates the need for behavioral objectives in order to conduct an individualized reading program. Derenzis (1971) and Beck (1969) both found behavioral objectives necessary for the effective use of Individually Prescribed Instruction (IPI).

Several research articles examining nongradedness and individualized instruction showed gains in reading achievement and listed the use of a scope and sequence of reading skills as an essential element of the program.

---

(3) Artley, A. Sterl. "Secondary Developmental Reading Programs -- Are They Feasible?" Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, April 23, 1971. ED 053 871.

(7) Beck, Isabel L. and Bolvin, John O. "A Model for Nongradedness: The Reading Program for Individually Prescribed Instruction." Pittsburgh University Learning Research and Development Center, 1969. ED 033 832.

(19) Buchanan, Anne, and others. "Monitoring the Progress of the Group in an Individualized Reading Program Based on Behavioral Objectives." Paper presented at meeting of American Educational Research Association, February 4-7, 1971. ED 047 925.

(26) Derenzis, Joseph J. "Individually Prescribed Instruction: Background Information and Research." Paper presented at the Meeting of the International Reading Association, April 19-23, 1971. ED 051 974.

(38) Fay, Leo C. "Curriculum Guide in Reading. Remedial Reading, Grades 3-12." Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, 1965. ED 011 496.

(54) Hodder, Velma, and others. "A Position Paper on the Teaching of Reading, Developmental and Corrective." Nebraska State Department of Education, December 1965. ED 011 831.

(58) Karlin, Robert. "Characteristics of Sound Remedial Reading Instruction." Journal of the Reading Specialist (May 1966): 165-69.

(65) Lichtman, Marilyn. "Keys to a Successful Reading Program." The Reading Teacher (April 1971): 652-58.

(79) Otto, Henry J., and others. "Nongradedness: An Elementary School Evaluation." Bureau of Laboratory Schools Monograph No. 21, Texas University, 1969. ED 036 889.

(84) Rentel, Victor M. "Ends and Means -- Developing Specific Objectives for Reading Instruction." May 1967. ED 015 089.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Program

2. *Coordination and Articulation of All Special Reading Programs With the Basic Curriculum.*

There is a coordination and articulation between all federally funded, volunteer, and other reading and language arts programs with the basic reading curriculum.

The literature search provided few studies related to this criterion, but the few articles that were found tended to be supportive. Boercker's article on the Head Start Program stressed the need to continue the experiences gained during the summer program during the school year. The effect of such coordination has led to the successful preparation of children for increased academic achievement. One of the responsibilities a reading director has to assume is the transmission of information from successful programs at the local, state, or national level to the individual schools (McNeil).

---

(13) Boercker, Marguerite and Ramsey, Wallace. "The Influence of a Head Start Program on Reading Achievement." May 1967. ED 012 685.

(59) Kipling, Cecil. "An Optimum Reading Program for Grades K-12 and School District Organization." South Dakota University, November 1, 1967. ED 018 341.

(67) McNeil, Shirley. "The Role of the Reading Coordinator." Great Cities School Improvement Program, Detroit, Michigan, February 1965. ED 001 005.

(69) Meyer, Ronald E. "Reflections on Title III: Omaha Central Reading Clinic." Paper presented to the International Reading Association Conference, April 30-May 3, 1969. ED 033 837.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Program

3. Individual Student Record-Keeping System.

A continuous record-keeping system of reading progress is maintained for each individual student.

A continuous record-keeping system was indicated to be an essential component of any reading program (Beck, Fay). Several functions would be attained through this process: (1) the immediate evaluation of the student's progress in terms of his strengths and weaknesses (Lichtman); (2) the modification and adjustment of the program to meet the needs of the student (Blakely) and (3) the more accurate reporting of a student's progress to both the child and his parents. The first of these two are components of individualized instruction, the most highly supported criterion.

The articles surveyed stressed that continuous evaluation would allow for day-to-day and week-to-week adjustments in the student's program. It would not be necessary to wait until the end of a term to make needed changes.

Beck suggested that a computer-managed record system would be a significant innovation for the prompt feedback of a student's progress.

---

(7) Beck, Isabel L. and Bolvin, John O. "A Model for Nongradedness: The Reading Program for Individually Prescribed Instruction." Pittsburgh University Learning Research and Development Center, 1969. ED 033 832.

(12) Blakely, W. Paul and McKay, Beverly. "Individualized Reading as Part of an Eclectic Reading Program." Elementary English (March 1966): 214-19.

(37) Fay, Leo C. and others. "Curriculum Guide in Reading. Developmental Reading, Grades 1-8." Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, 1966. ED 011 495.

(56) "How Does your Remedial Reading Stack Up?" NJEA Review (March 1970): 16-19.

(65) Lichtman, Marilyn. "Keys to a Successful Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (April 1971): 652-58.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Program

4. *Coordination with Preschool Programs.*

The local education agency works cooperatively with existing preschool components to coordinate and articulate reading programs.

The literature concerning kindergarten readiness programs is reviewed for criterion IA 10 (a criterion omitted from the final list), but this criterion was interpreted to go beyond that scope to include a wider area of preschool programs.

The literature concerning the success of the Head Start Program and the Montessori School seems appropriate here. As one example, Boercker investigated a Head Start Program and found that it achieved success in preparing children for academic learning.

Elliot reviews research that supports Montessori's early emphasis on reading and then describes a Montessori program. Other Head Start research and Montessori literature should be examined, along with similar preschool programs that prepare children for reading instruction.

This search revealed no literature concerning cooperation among school districts and preschool programs.

---

(13) Boercker, Marguerite and Ramsey, Wallace. "The Influence of a Head Start Program on Reading Achievement." May 1967. ED 012 685.

(29) Elliott, Lee. "Montessori's Reading Principles Involving Sensitive Period Method Compared to Reading Principles of Contemporary Reading Specialists." The Reading Teacher 21 (November 1967): 163-68

(40) Geis, Robley. "A Preventive Summer Program for Kindergarten Children Likely to Fail in First Grade Reading. Final Report," La Canada Unified School District, California, July 1968. ED 030 495.

(55) Hoppock, Anne. "Reading in the Kindergarten." New Jersey State Department of Education, March 1966.

(86) Robinson, R. E. "First-Grade Reading Instruction." The Asheville City Schools, 1965-66. ED 010 171.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Program

5. *Adult Basic Education Reading Component.*

The local education agency has an adult basic education reading component.

The literature search offered little to support the criterion. One article mentioned that a number of adults were referred to a clinic designed for assisting adolescent illiterates (Brown) referred by a wide range of local agencies, including the Marriage Guidance Council Neurological Institute, psychiatric hospitals, and the probationary service. This seems to indicate that such a program is needed.

There may be research in this area that this limited search did not locate. It is suggested that this area, along with local education agency coordination of other programs be the subject of an additional search.

---

(17) Brown, R. I. "A Remedial Reading Program for the Adolescent Illiterate." The Journal of Special Education 1: 409-17.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Program

6. Continuous Reading Program.

The local education agency has a continuous educational program which includes provisions for summer instruction in reading.

The literature search on summer programs did not yield a significant number of articles; however, the conclusions reached in the articles were consistent. Summer instruction in reading was found to be a valuable component of the total instructional program if two considerations were met:

(1) The program should be integrated into the total reading program. A reading program designed to build on the summer program was found to lead to gains in reading achievement.

(2) The summer instructional staff should be well-versed in reading methods and the district's reading program.

---

(13) Boercker, Marguerite and Ramsey, Wallace. "The Influence of a Head Start Program on Reading Achievement." May 1967. ED 012 685.

(37) Fay, Leo G. and others. "Curriculum Guide in Reading. A Developmental Reading, Grades 1-8." Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, 1966. ED 011 495.

(40) Geis, Robley. "A Preventive Summer Program for Kindergarten Children Likely to Fail in First Grade Reading." Final Report, LaCanada Unified School District, California, July 1968. ED 030 495.

(43) Gomberg, Adeline. "The Lighthouse Day Camp Reading Experiment with Disadvantaged Children." The Reading Teacher (January 1966): 243-52.

(45) Greenshields, Charles M. "A Follow-up Study of Disadvantaged Children Who had Experienced Preschool Education." Child Study Research Center, State University at Buffalo.

(54) Hodder, Velma and others. "A Position Paper on the Teaching of Reading, Developmental and Corrective." Nebraska State Department of Education, December 1965. ED 011 831.

(80) Pennsylvania Department of Education. "A Six-Week Summer Remedial Reading Program." Project to Utilize Resources in Education, 1969.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Program

7. *Incentives for Staff Development.*

The board of education of the local education agency has an incentive program for teacher staff development in reading.

This literature search did not reveal any specific references to incentive programs for teacher staff development in reading, but a few implications can be drawn from some of the suggestions for teacher preparation, in-service programs and staff development programs.

An examination of the literature for criteria IB 2 (Continuous Staff Development) and IB 3 (Training of Content Area Teachers) shows a definite need for staff development programs. Smith reports on a program in which volunteer classroom teachers were given 20 hours of special training in reading and one-half day a week released time to assist their principals in reading curriculum development. Chern concluded that administrators should be willing to release time for programs, to hire specialists as resource persons, and to promote an atmosphere of creative and innovative thinking. With these two reports as examples, the only incentive suggested appears to be released time for programs. Summers warned of the failure of present programs, which may indicate that additional incentives should be considered.

Bramm and Roehm indicated that present channels of communication between experts and classroom teachers were inadequate. He poses this as a challenge to those

interested in improving reading. Incentive programs may be a way to meet this challenge.

Incentive programs beyond the field of reading should be investigated for further implications.

---

(15) Braam, Leonard S. and Roehm, Marilyn A. "Subject Area Teachers' Familiarity with Reading Skills." Journal of Developmental Reading (1964): 188-96.

(21) Chern, Nona. "Inservice Education in Reading: The Realization of the Potential-Symposium III." Paper presented at International Reading Associates Conference, April 24-27, 1968. ED 028 020.

(90) Smith, Richard J. "The Role of Reading Resource Teacher." Paper presented at the International Reading Association Conference, May 6-9, 1970. ED 042 578.

(93) Summers. "Reading in the Secondary School." Review of Educational Research 37 (April 1967): 137-38.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Program

8. *Media Center*

Each school in the local education agency has a media center which is operated on an open basis and is readily accessible to students and teachers.

This criterion was supported by the literature reviewed in the search. Few studies could be found however that linked the operation of an open, accessible media center to gains in reading achievement. Therefore the information reported here is the consensus of the specialists rather than results of studies.

The open, accessible media center is considered to be an important factor in the total reading program (Hodder). Three propositions appear to be most relevant to the reading program: (1) the media center must have a conducive, inviting environment; (2) the media center must contain a variety of materials to stimulate interests; and (3) the media center specialists should establish a cooperative working arrangement with the school faculty.

Sections III 3 (Supportive Media) and III 4 (Central Location for Reading Materials) contain several articles also related to this criterion which stress the need for the establishment of reading laboratories in schools.

---

(22) Clay, Rema. "Hub of the Instructional Program. A Casebook of Library Services." American Library 1 (February 1970).

(32) "Facility Sharing Works for Washburne and Skokie Schools." American School and University 42 (April 1970): 38-39.

(44) Goodwin, Georgie J. "An Educational Tool for All. A Casebook of School Library Service." American Library 1 (February 1970): 164-65.

(49) Hatfield, Frances. "Individualized Learning in the Flexible School. A Casebook of School Library Services." American Library 1 (February 1970): 169-70.

(54) Hodder, Velma and others. "A Position Paper on the Teaching of Reading, Developmental and Corrective." Nebraska State Department of Education, December 1965. ED 011 831.

(61) LaBudde, Constance and Smith, Richard J. "Librarians Look at Remedial Reading." The Reading Teacher (December 1973): 263-70

(79) Otto, Henry J. and others. "Nongradedness: An Elementary School Evaluation, Bureau of Laboratory School Monograph No. 21." Texas University, 1966. ED 036 889.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Program

9. *Testing System.*

The local education agency has a complete testing system which includes the use of criterion-referenced measures.

It is difficult to determine adequate descriptors to use for a search from the phrase "complete testing system." Those used relate to evaluation and various forms of evaluation.

Sanders states that it is meaningless to discuss evaluating a "school reading program" until you specify the level to be evaluated. He defines levels and roles of evaluation within the classroom, school, and school system.

Other authors emphasize the need for a thorough testing system in making decisions about reading programs, but suggest caution in using standardized tests (Farr, Rauch).

Still other authors recommend testing and establishment of criterion-referenced tests to measure success on at least two levels: (1) evaluating the program and procedures used, (2) evaluating the child's progress in developing reading skills (Hammond, Farr, Fay, NJEA Review).

The need for diagnostic testing, both formal and informal, along with ongoing evaluation of a child's progress, in order to make appropriate modifications, are recommended (Karlin, Beck, Brown). One means of meeting this objective is through the development of behavioral objectives, which are suggested as an element of a successful reading program by several authors (Lichtman, Beck, and Brown and Farr).

(7) Beck, Isabel L. and Bolvin, John O. "A Model for Nongradedness: The Reading Program for Individually Prescribed Instruction." Pittsburgh University Learning Research and Development Center, 1969. ED 033 832.

(17) Brown, R. I. "A Remedial Reading Program for the Adolescent Illiterate." The Journal of Special Education 1: 409-17.

(34) Farr, Roger. "Reading Diagnosis: Trends and Issues." Paper presented at the meeting of the Nassau Reading Council, Uniondale, New York, March 9, 1971. ED 050 899.

(35) Farr, Roger. "The Fallacies of Testing." Paper presented to the Conference on Reading and the National Interest, March 22-24, 1970. ED 040 020.

(36) Farr, Roger and Brown, Virginia L. "Evaluation and Decision Making." The Reading Teacher 24 (January 1971): 341-54.

(37) Fay, Leo C. and others. "Curriculum Guide in Reading. Developmental Reading, Grades 1-8." Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, 1966. ED 011 495.

(47) Hammond, Robert L. "Accountability Through Context Evaluation of Reading Performance." Journal of Research and Development in Education (Fall 1971): 31-36.

(56) "How Does Your Remedial Reading Stack Up?" NJEA Review (March 1970): 16-19.

(58) Karlin, Robert. "Characteristics of Sound Remedial Reading Instruction." Journal of the Reading Specialist (May 1966): 165-69.

(65) Lichtman, Marilyn. "Keys to a Successful Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (April 1971): 652-58.

(82) Rauch, Sidney J. "How to Evaluate a Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (December 1970): 244-50.

(85) Research and Information Service for Education (RISE). "RISE Bibliography on Behavioral Objectives/Reading K-6." May 1972.

(87) Sanders, James R. "Consideration in Evaluating School Reading Programs." Viewpoints 48 (September): 15-25.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

B. Staff

1. *Variation of Student/Teacher Ratios as Necessary.*

The local education agency varies the student/teacher ratios as necessary to meet the objectives of the reading instructional program.

None of the research reviewed was specifically directed at studying the success of varying student/teacher ratio, but several articles mentioned this as one factor that contributed to the success of the program.

Stowe describes a departmentalized high school reading program that limited class size to 20 students. The provision was judged by those participating as the chief factor in the success of the program.

Artley, reviewing research by Nason (1965), suggests that a reading class of disadvantaged junior high students should not be over 10. Dramer showed gains in reading achievement with an experimental group of 12 underachieving students who were taught reading in subject matter areas.

The results of Smith's study indicate that students in high and low achievement groups obtained the highest degree of congruency between assigned and actual activity when placed in small group situations, while average students obtained the highest degree of congruency under whole class instruction.

Klosterman says the use of a diagnostically structured reading program implies flexibility in grouping. The use of aides in a reading program is another method of helping vary student/teacher ratio (refer to evidence under IB 4,

[Trained Volunteer Helpers] for further implications.)

Also see Section II 2 (Individualized Instruction) for additional implications since flexibility in grouping is a necessity when provisions are made for teaching every student at his own instructional level.

---

(2) Anderson, Richard C. "The Case for Nongraded Homogeneous Grouping." The Elementary School Journal (January 1962): 193-97.

(5) Artley, A. Sterl. "Trends and Practice in Secondary School Reading: A Report on Recent Research." ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, 1968. ED 024 560.

(28) Dramer, Dan. "Self-Contained Reading Oriented Classes in Secondary Schools." Paper presented at the International Reading Association Conference, May 1970. ED 041 705.

(60) Klosterman, Sister Rita. "The Effectiveness of a Diagnostically Structured Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (November 1970): 159-67.

(79) Otto, Henry J. and others. "Nongradedness: An Elementary School Evaluation, Bureau of Laboratory Schools Monograph," No. 21. Texas University, 1969. ED 036 889.

(88) Smith, George. "The Development of an Instrument to Record the Interaction Between Teacher and Pupil in the Classroom and the Correlation of Certain Factors with Achievement." Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971.

(92) Stowe, Elaine. "A Departmentalized High School Reading Program." 1971. ED 055 750.

(97) Warterberg, Herbert; Hancley, Lilyan;and Locke, Maurice. "Developing A Full-time Reading Center Within a Public School Setting." The Reading Teacher 24 (March 1971): 532-36; 560.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

B. Staff

8. *Continuous Staff Development.*

The local education agency has a continuous staff development program in reading for all teachers, administrators, and supportive personnel.

The need for staff development programs in reading for all teachers, administrators, and supportive personnel was supported by the literature reviewed. The preservice preparation of teachers (especially at the high school level) did not even make teachers aware of the types of problems to be encountered, much less adequately equip the teacher with tools to develop programs (Artley).

Elements that contribute to the success of staff development programs include: released time for participants, flexibility of the program, orientation of the program to specific problems, and schoolwide planning of the programs (Smith, Chern, McNeil).

There did not appear to be a consensus on in-service format; however, Chern emphasized the need for a continuous program that met twice a week for a number of weeks rather than short, intensive programs.

Although the necessity for in-service programs has been cited, Summers in his review of the literature warns of lack of success of many staff development programs. Reasons for the lack of success varied, but poor planning, failure to involve the participants in the program design,

and failure to allow for the flexibility of treating the specific problems found within the school seemed the most important.

See Criteria IB 3 (Training Content Area Teachers) and IA 7 (Incentives for Staff Development) for additional implications for this criterion.

---

(5) Artley, A. Sterl. "Trends and Practice in Secondary School Reading: A Report on Recent Research." ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, 1968. ED 024 560.

(15) Braam, Leonard S. and Roehm, Marilyn A. "Subject Area Teachers' Familiarity with Reading Skills." Journal of Developmental Reading (1964): 188-96.

(16) Briscoe, Cecil D. "A Reading Program with Lay Aides and Programmed Material." The Clearinghouse (February 1969): 373-77.

(18) Brown, Edward K. "The Nongraded Program at the Powell Elementary School: Evaluative Phase II." Philadelphia School District, April 1970. ED 049 298.

(21) Chern, Nona. "In-service Education in Reading: The Realization of the Potential Symposium III." Paper presented at International Reading Associate's Conference, April 24-27, 1968. ED 028 020.

(42) Gold, Lawrence. "Preparing Classroom Teachers to Work With Severely Underachieving Pupils Through an Internship in a Regional Learning Disability Center." Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Statewide Reading Conference, Grossinger, New York, April 8-10, 1970. ED 040 829.

(50) Herber, Harold L. "Reading in Content Areas: A District Develops Its Own Personnel." Journal of Reading (May 1970): 587-92.

(67) McMenemy, Richard A. "The Remedial [Reading] Teacher: Special Training and Professional Responsibilities." Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, April 19-23, 1971. ED 051 965.

(68) McNeil, Shirley. "The Role of the Reading Coordinator." Great Cities School Improvement Program, Detroit, Michigan, February 1965. ED 001 005.

(72) "Model Programs: Reading, Elementary Reading Centers, Milwaukee, Wisconsin." American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto. ED 053 885.

(74) Moore, Walter J. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Reading in the Content Fields?" English Journal 54 (May 1969): 707-18.

(75) Morrill, Katherine A. "A Comparison of Two Methods of Reading Supervision." May 1966. ED 010 974.

(86) Robinson, R. E. "First-Grade Reading Instruction." The Asheville City Schools, 1965-66. ED 010 171.

(89) Smith, Nila Banton, ed. "Reading Methods and Teacher Improvement." International Reading Association, 1971. ED 051 969.

(90) Smith, Richard J. "The Role of Reading Resource Teacher." Paper presented at the International Reading Association Conference, May 6-9, 1970. ED 042 578.

(92) Stowe, Elaine. "A Departmentalized High School Reading Program." 1971. ED 055 750.

(93) Summers. "Reading in the Secondary School." Review of Educational Research 37 (April 1967): 137-38.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

B. Staff

3. *Training of Content Area Teachers.*

The local education agency provides training to teachers in the content areas to develop competencies which will allow them to adjust instruction to the varying reading achievement levels of their students.

Artley cited a study in which content area teachers determined that the key to the individualization of instruction was to allow "students to read on levels commensurate with their achievement." This assertion was supported by most of the studies listed here and in II 1; however, the rates of success in meeting this objective have not been impressive.

Several of the articles stated that the development of increased competencies in reading instruction was necessary for content area teachers, but the preservice education of most teachers did not provide the necessary background (Summers, Artley, Herber).

In-service programs have had varying degrees of success in preparing teachers to meet this objective. Summers, and Braam and Roehm stated that traditional in-service programs have been of limited success in increasing teacher awareness of the reading skills necessary for successful reading or of determining individual student's strengths and weaknesses. However, articles by Herber and Artley describe in-service programs that have successfully increased teacher awareness of the skills required to relate reading to the content areas.

(5) Artley, A Sterl. "Trends and Practice in Secondary School Reading: A Report on Recent Research." ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, 1968. ED 024 560.

(15) Braam, Leonard S. and Roehm, Marilyn A. "Subject-Area Teachers' Familiarity with Reading Skills." Journal of Developmental Reading (1964): 188-96.

(27) Dolan, Sister Mary Edward. "Secondary Developmental Reading Programs -- Are They Feasible?" Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, April 19-23, 1971. ED 054 911.

(50) Herber, Harold L. "Reading in Content Areas: A District Develops It's Own Personnel." Journal of Reading (May 1970): 587-92.

(57) Jones, Daisy Marvel. "Reading in the Content Areas, or This is Not the Same as Reading a Story." Paper presented at the meeting of the Keystone State Reading Association, October 29, 1970. ED 046 658.

(93) Summers. "Reading in the Secondary School." Review of Educational Research 37 (April 1967): 137-38.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

B. Staff

4. *Trained Volunteer Helpers.*

The local education agency has trained volunteer helpers in reading instruction.

Literature relating to this criteria can be divided into several categories.

There is overwhelming support for the use of aides for reading instruction, but most of the literature examines use of hired aides rather than volunteers. Smith gives suggestions for the use of paraprofessionals as reading aides. Briscoe reported success of students in a reading program with trained lay aides and programmed materials. Meyer reported success of a clinic using part-time trained teachers and trained volunteers as aides.

A Minneapolis project using aides recommended that further research is needed on the kinds of training necessary, but the authors believe the services of trained aides should free teachers to work more closely with children in areas where greatest professional skills and competence are required. Stowe reported success in a program where teacher aides and adult assistants were used for individual help and clerical duties to relieve teachers for work with students. Student aides were also used, but only for clerical assistance. Other programs have had success with students tutoring younger students. Klosterman reported student achievement gains in a reading program using elementary education students as tutors.

Most of the available literature concerning the use of aides involves remedial reading programs rather than regular developmental programs, but the use of aides in reading is supported by the literature.

---

(16) Briscoe, Cecil D. "A Reading Program with Lay Aides and Programmed Material." The Clearinghouse (February 1969): 373-77.

(60) Klosterman, Sister Rita. "The Effectiveness of a Diagnostically Structured Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (November 1970): 159-67.

(69) Meyer, Ronald E. "Reflections on Title III: Omaha Central Reading Clinic." Paper presented to the International Reading Association Conference, April 30-May 3, 1969. ED 033 837.

(71) Minneapolis' Special School District Number 1, Minnesota. "Teacher Aide Program, 1966-67." 1967. ED 024 643.

(89) Smith, Nila Banton, ed. "Reading Methods and Teacher Improvement." International Reading Association, 1971. ED 051 969.

(92) Stowe, Elaine. "A Departmentalized High School Reading Program." 1971. ED 055 750.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

B. Staff

5. *Media Center.*

Each school in the local education agency has a media center which is staffed by professional and supportive personnel.

Very little literature related to this criterion was located.

The studies reviewed for criterion IA 8 (Media Center) which concern the use and availability of library materials seem to imply that the media center should be well staffed. Brown reported a study evaluating a nongraded program and included a recommendation that there was need for a full-time instructional media assistant.

LaBudde reviews literature which stresses a need for librarians to work cooperatively with classroom teachers and remedial reading teachers. She discusses librarians' perception of reading teachers and reading teachers' perceptions of librarians. A survey was conducted to determine librarians' perceptions of their role in the reading program. Conclusions and recommendations from the survey included: (1) the need for scheduled conference times between reading teacher and librarian (possibly with the classroom teacher); (2) the need for communication concerning individual children; and (3) cooperation in ordering and using materials. LaBudde also suggested that librarians should have a course in reading and reading teachers should have more emphasis in their education on extending their services through the librarian. Also she suggests that administrators

should encourage this interaction.

These conclusions seem to imply the need for a well-trained library staff.

---

(17) Brown, Edward K. "The Nongraded Program at the Powell Elementary School: Evaluative Phase II." Philadelphia School District, April 1970. ED 049 298.

(61) LaBudde, Constance and Smith, Richard J. "Librarians Look at Remedial Reading." The Reading Teacher (December 1973): 263-70.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

B. Staff

6. *LEA Director of All Reading Activities.*

The local education agency has a director of all reading activities who has authority, responsibility, and time granted by the superintendent and board of education to organize, implement, and coordinate a comprehensive reading program.

The literature reviewed for this criteria, while not extensive, stressed the necessity of a designated professional that is provided the time and authority to coordinate the reading program for the district. The duties of the director (also called coordinator, specialist) will necessitate close working relationships with both the school reading teacher and other classroom teachers.

Kipling states that every administrative district should provide a reading coordinator to supervise all reading programs who should have the time to teach, supervise reading labs, and conduct in-service programs. McNeil suggests that the emphasis of the coordinator must be on working with teachers rather than students to best utilize the coordinator's expertise. The reading coordinator has to be full-time to relate reading programs to other special programs (such as speech) as well as the general school program. Herber suggested that one of the reasons for the success of the Norfolk experimental reading program was the availability of a full-time coordinator to work with the reading coordinator in each school.

(50) Herber, Harold L. "Reading in Content Areas: A District Develops Its Own Personnel." Journal of Reading (May 1970): 587-92.

(56) "How Does Your Remedial Reading Stack Up?" NJEA Review (March 1970): 16-19.

(59) Kipling, Cecil. "An Optimum Reading Program for Grades K-12, and School District Organization." South Dakota University, November 1, 1967. ED 018 341.

(68) McNeil, Shirley. "The Role of the Reading Coordinator." Great Cities School Improvement Program, Detroit, Michigan, February 1965. ED 001 005.

(90) Smith, Richard J. "The Role of Reading Resource Teacher." Paper presented at the International Reading Association Conference, May 6-9,1970. ED 042 578.

I. ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION

C. Community Relations

1. Report to the Parents.

Each local education agency has a reporting system that fully, accurately and specifically communicates a student's progress in reading to parents.

Literature concerning this criterion can be divided into three categories: (1) general reporting; (2) reporting on the reading program; and (3) reporting on remedial reading programs.

A survey of general practices in reporting to parents was summarized by Tyau. The survey showed reporting techniques were diversified to meet the needs of the individual schools; but, in order to be effective, reporting must be a continuous, cumulative, and cooperative procedure.

In regard to remedial reading programs, Fay recommends contacting parents when reading retardation is determined, and holding conferences to get the cooperation of parents and to keep them informed. He gives suggestions for the content of those meetings. Hodder suggests ways of orienting parents to the components of the entire reading program in group meetings and gives suggestion for conducting individual parent conferences. Beery suggests ways that parents can be kept constantly informed of daily pupil work and progress in addition to formal reporting techniques. Lloyd reports on New York City's effort to get parents involved and outlines successful techniques used there. Other articles list reporting to parents as one of the

essential elements of a good reading program.

In general it is agreed that reporting to parents is necessary, but no literature was reviewed that demonstrated gains in reading due to types of reporting.

Additional support for this type of criterion would have to come out of the literature on community relations.

---

(4) Artley, A. Sterl. "The Reading Specialist Talks to the Public." The Reading Teacher (May 1965): 645-48.

(8) Beery, Althea. "Schools Report to Parents." The Reading Teacher (May 1965): 639-44.

(37) Fay, Leo C. and others. "Curriculum Guide in Reading. Developmental Reading, Grades 1-8." Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, 1966. ED 011 495.

(54) Hodder, Velma and others. "A Position Paper on the Teaching of Reading, Developmental and Corrective." Nebraska State Department of Education, December 1965. ED 011 831.

(56) "How Does Your Remedial Reading Stack Up?" NJEA Review (March 1970): 16-19.

(66) Lloyd, Helene M. "New York City's Program for Developing the Role of Parents in Reading Progress." The Reading Teacher (May 1965): 629-33.

(94) Tyau, Frances Siu Lan. "Campus Schools' Parent Reporting Procedures." Child Study Center Bulletin. State University College at Buffalo.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

C. Community Relations

2. *Report to the Community.*

The local education agency introduces, explains, and periodically reports the reading program to the school community.

In general, available literature supports this criterion. Beery suggested the need for reporting on three different levels: (1) system-wide reporting; (2) local reporting; and (3) classroom reporting. She suggested that this could be done through publications on all three levels, along with programs for parental participation and reporting at PTA meetings. Sanders recommends evaluation techniques on all levels and stresses the importance of publicizing the results for the consumers; those who pay for the program. Hammond outlines a method of context evaluation of reading performance to be used in judging accountability and suggests that the evaluation should be utilized by the public to register an attitude based on knowledge of the program. Artley stresses the necessity for the reading specialist to be the one who talks to the public, since the reading specialists are most qualified to speak knowledgeably about the program. He suggests that taxpayers can be kept informed through the media and community organizations. Lloyd describes the successful effort in New York City which involved television and radio programs, exhibits, and workshops for parents and community. The coordinators are finding success in involving parents and feel sure that it will help children's reading ability;

but as in other literature reviewed in this area, no studies are cited as evidence that reading has improved.

Also see literature reviewed in section IC 1 for additional implications and ideas for this criterion.

---

(4) Artley, A. Sterl. "The Reading Specialist Talks to the Public." The Reading Teacher (May 1965): 645-48.

(8) Beery, Althea. "Schools Report to Parents." The Reading Teacher (May 1965): 639-44.

(47) Hammond, Robert L. "Accountability Through Context Evaluation of Reading Performance." Journal of Research and Development in Education (Fall 1971): 31-36.

(56) "How Does Your Remedial Reading Stack Up?" NJEA Review (March 1970): 16-19.

(66) Lloyd, Helene M. "New York City's Program for Developing the Role of Parents in Reading Progress." The Reading Teacher (May 1965): 629-33.

(87) Sanders, James R. "Considerations in Evaluating School Reading Programs." Viewpoints 48 (September): 15-25.

I. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

C. Community Relations

3. *Sharing of Instructional Methods.*

The local education agency shows willingness to share instructional methods and materials which have proved effective in reading programs.

The literature search provided few references for this criterion; however, the few articles cited tended to support it. McNeil suggests that the role of the school reading specialists should include assisting teachers in obtaining and sharing effective materials and teaching methods. In a similar fashion, one of the responsibilities of the district reading coordinator is to conduct ongoing evaluation of the materials and methods used in the member schools so that effective methods and materials can be disseminated throughout the district (NJEA Review).

---

(56) "How Does Your Remedial Reading Stack Up?" NJEA Review (March 1970): 16-19.

(68) McNeil, Shirley. "The Role of the Reading Coordinator." Great Cities School Improvement Program, Detroit, Michigan, February 1965. ED 001 005.

(72) "Model Programs: Reading, Elementary Reading Centers, Milwaukee, Wisconsin." American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto. ED 053 885.

II. INSTRUCTION

1. *Junior-Senior High Teacher Knowledge of Developmental Reading.* Teachers of reading at the junior and senior high school levels have a demonstrated knowledge of developmental reading as it relates to the reading curriculum of the local education agency.

The literature seems to support this criterion in theory but many authors point out the lack of this concept in practice. Stowe found that high school English teachers often teach reading; yet "the high school English teacher who has had training in the teaching of reading is so rare as to be virtually nonexistent." Artley, in summarizing a study by Geake reports that some reading programs surveyed had to be discontinued because of the inability to find qualified teachers. Artley also describes Squire's report of reading programs where reading specialists were members of the English Department, but he found that "apparently such staffing does not guarantee success." He goes on to say that in many schools those responsible for the reading program confused the teaching of reading with the teaching of slow learners and were unsuccessful.

McMenemy, in discussing the special training and responsibility of the reading teacher, states that reading teachers should understand and practice the basic rules for success in reading. An article in the NJEA Review cites the necessity to develop people skilled in remedial and developmental reading because of a shortage of trained personnel in these areas. It emphasizes the need for close coordination between the reading teacher and the reading coordinator of the system.

Kipling, in his recommendations, states that a goal of a secondary reading program should be the continuation of skill building started in the elementary grades. He recommends a program of developmental reading for all students in grades 6, 7,and 8. A senior high developmental program should be established for those who could profit from this instruction. He concludes that each district should have a reading specialist to coordinate all reading programs. Artley sees a need for this also, but he found a lack of any coordination pattern or system of instruction of secondary reading programs.

---

(3) Artley, A. Sterl. "Secondary Developmental Reading Programs -- Are They Feasible?" Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, April 23, 1971. ED 053 871.

(5) Artley, A. Sterl. "Trends and Practices in Secondary School Reading: A Report on Recent Research." ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, 1968. ED 024 560.

(56) "How Does Your Remedial Reading Program Stack Up?" NJEA Review (March 1970): 16-19.

(59) Kipling, Cecil. "An Optimum Reading Program for Grades K-12 and School District Organization." South Dakota University, November 1, 1967. ED 018 341.

(67) McMenemy, Richard A. "The Remedial [Reading] Teacher: Special Training and Professional Responsibilities." Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, April 19-23, 1971. ED 051 965.

(92) Stowe, Elaine. "A Departmentalized High School Reading Program." 1971. ED 055 750.

II. INSTRUCTION

2. *Individualized Instruction.*

Provisions are made for teaching every student at his own instructional level and learning rate.

Because of the difficulty in defining and operationalizing "teaching every student at his own instructional level," definitive research was difficult to locate; but there is overwhelming evidence that this is considered as a major criterion for most successful programs. (Cotter, Robinson, Karlin, Lichtman.)

Several studies claim that individualizing instruction is fulfilled by nongraded schools and most of the studies reviewed demonstrated gains in achievement through nongradedness. (Brown, Otto, Gumpper, Anderson, Beck, Wilt, Engel and Cooper, Hilson, Remacle, Lewis.)

Other ways of individualizing instruction include the use of Individually Prescribed Instruction (I.P.I.) (Beck, Derenzis), diagnostically structured programs (Klasterman), and remedial reading programs (Warterberg, Crawford and Conley).

Many authors state that individualizing instruction is essential to a good reading program and proceed to give suggestions for teaching every student at his own instructional level (Newman, Blakely and McKay).

---

(2) Anderson, Richard C. "The Case for Nongraded Homogeneous Grouping." The Elementary School Journal (January 1962): 193-97.

(5) Artley, A. Sterl. "Trends and Practice in Secondary School Reading: A Report on Recent Research." ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, 1968. ED 024 560.

(7) Beck, Isabel L. and Bolvin, John O. "A Model for Nongradedness: The Reading Program for Individually Prescribed Instruction." Pittsburgh University Learning Research and Development Center, 1969. ED 033 832.

(12) Blakely, W. Paul and McKay, Beverly. "Individualized Reading as Part of an Eclectic Reading Program." Elementary English (March 1966): 214-19.

(17) Brown, Edward K. "The Nongraded Program at the Powell Elementary School: Evaluative Phase II." Philadelphia School District, Pennsylvania, April 1970. ED 049 298.

(23) Cotter, Katharine. "First-Grade Failure: Diagnosis, Treatment, and Prevention." Childhood Education (November 1967): 172-76.

(25) Crawford, Gail and Conley, Dick. "Meet You in Reading Lab!" Journal of Reading (October 1971): 16-21,

(26) Derenzis, Joseph J. "Individually Prescribed Instruction: Background Information and Research." Paper presented at the Meeting of the International Reading Association, April 19-23, 1971. ED 051 974.

(31) Engel, Barney M. and Cooper, Martin. "Academic Achievement and Nongradedness." The Journal of Experimental Education 40 (Winter 1971).

(46) Gumpper. Nongraded Elementary Education: Individualized Learning -- Teacher Leadership -- Student Responsibility. University Park: Institute for Research on Human Resources, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971. ED 057 440.

(53) Hillson, Maurice; Jones, J. Charles; Moore, J. William; and Van Devender, Frank. "A Controlled Experiment Evaluating the Effects of a Nongraded Organization on Pupil Achievement." The Journal of Educational Research 57 (July-August 1964): 548-50.

(58) Karlin, Robert. "Characteristics of Sound Remedial Reading Instruction." Journal of the Reading Specialist (May 1966): 165-69.

(60) Klosterman, Sister Rita. "The Effectiveness of a Diagnostically Structured Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (November 1970): 159-67.

(64) Lewis, Ruth Christine. "A Study of the Results of the Brandonville Project in Nongraded Instruction." Dissertation Abstracts International 31 (June 1971): 6472A.

(65) Lichtman, Marilyn. "Keys to a Successful Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (April 1971): 652-58.

(77) Newman, Robert E. "The Individualized Approach to Reading Instruction -- Key Concepts." May 1967. ED 017 396.

(79) Otto, Henry J. and others. "Nongradedness: An Elementary School Evaluation." Bureau of Laboratory Schools Monograph, No. 21, Texas University, 1969. ED 036 889.

(83) Remacle, Leo. "A Comparative Study of the Differences in Attitudes, Self-Concept, and Achievement of Children in Graded and Nongraded Elementary Schools." Dissertation Abstracts International 31 (May 1971): 5948-A.

(86) Robinson, R. E. "First-Grade Reading Instruction." The Asheville City Schools, 1965-1966. ED 010 171.

(88) Smith, George. "The Development of an Instrument to Record the Interaction Between Teacher and Pupil in the Classroom and the Correlation of Certain Factors with Achievement." Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971.

(97) Waterberg, Herbert; Hancley, Lilyan; and Locke, Maurice. "Developing a Full-time Reading Center Within a Public School Setting." The Reading Teacher 24 (March 1971): 532-36, 560.

(98) Wilt, Hiram Jack. "A Comparison of Student Attitudes Toward School, Academic Achievement, Integral Structures and Procedures: The Nongraded School vs. The Graded School." Dissertation Abstracts International 31 (April 1971): 5105-A.

II. INSTRUCTION

3. *Positive Environment.*

The teaching-learning environment is conducive to the development of positive attitudes toward reading.

This search of the literature revealed some studies with implications for this criterion but literature beyond the field of reading should be explored for further relevant material.

In general, opinions of authorities supported the need for positive attitudes toward reading (Withall, Summers, Calder). Guidelines for measuring the learning environment have been established.

Many of the studies contend that a teaching-learning environment conducive to the development of a positive attitude is an essential element of a nongraded school. Surveys of students, teachers, and parents in nongraded schools have supported this theory (Bowman, Wilt, Lewis). This environment has been given credit as one of the variables contributing to high student achievement in nongraded schools (Renacle, Vogel, Otto).

A positive attitude toward reading is also listed by many authors as one of the necessary factors in a successful reading program (Summers, Calder, Karlin, Stowe, Derenzis, Fader, Artley).

---

(5) Artley, A. Sterl. "Trends and Practice in Secondary School Reading: A Report on Recent Research." ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, 1968. ED 024 560.

(14) Bowman, Betty Lynch. "A Comparison of Pupil Achievement and Attitude in a Graded School with Pupil Achievement and Attitude in a Nongraded School 1968-69, 1969-70 School Years." Dissertation Abstracts International 32 (August 1971): 660-A, 661-A.

(20) Calder, Clarence, Jr. "Self-directed Reading Materials." The Reading Teacher 21 (December 1967): 249-52.

(25) Crawford, Gail and Conley, Dick. "Meet You in Reading Lab! Journal of Reading (October 1971): 16-21.

(26) Derenzis, Joseph J. "Individually Prescribed Instruction: Background Information and Research." Paper presented at the Meeting of the International Reading Association, April 19-23, 1971. ED 051 974.

(33) Fader, Daniel N. "English for Reluctant Learners, Grades 7-9, English in Every Classroom." University of Michigan, October, 1966. ED 010 424.

(58) Karlin, Robert. "Characteristics of Sound Remedial Reading Instruction." Journal of the Reading Specialist (May 1966): 165-69.

(64) Lewis, Ruth Christine. "A Study of the Results of the Brandonville Project in Nongraded Instruction." Dissertation Abstracts International 31 (June 1971): 6472A.

(74) Moore, Walter J. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Reading in the Content Fields?" English Journal 58 (May 1969): 707-18.

(79) Otto, Henry J. and others. "Nongradedness: An Elementary School Evaluation." Bureau of Laboratory Schools Monograph, No. 21, Texas University, 1969. ED 036 889.

(83) Remacle, Leo. "A Comparative Study of the Differences in Attitudes, Self-Concept, and Achievement of Children in Graded and Nongraded Elementary Schools." Dissertation Abstracts International 31 (May 1971): 5948-A.

(92) Stowe, Elaine. "A Departmentalized High School Reading Program." 1971. ED 055 750.

(93) Summers. "Reading in the Secondary School." Review of Educational Research 37 (April 1967): 137-38.

(96) Vogel, Francis X. and Bowers, Norman D. "The Relationship of Form of School Organization to Pupil Behavior." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, February 7, 1969. ED 028 503.

(98) Wilt, Hiram Jack. "A Comparison of Student Attitudes Toward School, Academic Achievement, Integral Structures and Procedures: The Nongraded School vs. the Graded School." Dissertation Abstracts International 31 (April 1971): 5105-A.

(99) Withall, John. "Evaluation of Classroom Climate." Childhood Education 45 (March 1969): 403-8.

II. INSTRUCTION

4. *Teacher Use of Various Reading Methods and Techniques.*

Every teacher demonstrates a knowledge of various methods and techniques used in the teaching of reading to make provisions for the differences that exist among students.

The strongest support for this criterion comes from Artley's review of 150 research studies. He documents the need for the use of a variety of methods and materials, more and better training of teachers, and provisions for individual differences among students. These elements, when considered together, pertain directly to this criterion.

Other researchers (Smith, Bowman) conducted studies in elementary schools and found that teachers did adapt their methods of instruction to various achievement levels of students.

Many authors agree that this is an essential element of a successful reading program. Lichtman lists as one element of success the diagnosis of each individual student in order to provide continuous information to enable a teacher to modify and adapt her program based on its effectiveness for each individual. Karlin points out the need for use of methods based upon principles of learning. He includes: learner's needs, successful experiences, guided learning, meaningful learning, interference, and transfer. He proceeds to elaborate on each of these as characteristics of a sound reading program. Valett presents a guide to diagnostic prescriptive task analysis that includes methods and techniques for planning for individual needs. Courtney points out that

to make reading relevant and necessary for youth, it must be taught as a means of achieving goals which are concerned with their attitudes and values. He believes that the content area teacher is in the most favorable position for teaching both content and process whereby the material is treated in depth and reading skills are applied immediately in context.

This criterion overlaps with several other criteria. Criteria IB 2 (Continuous Staff Development), IB 3 (Training Content Area Teachers), II 1 (Junior-Senior High Teacher Knowledge of Developmental Reading), and II 2 (Individualized Instruction) all have a relation to this criterion either in the area of knowledge and training of the teacher in reading programs, or in providing for individual differences among students. The literature accompanying these criteria should be examined in assessing criterion II 4.

---

(5) Artley, A. Sterl. "Trends and Practice in Secondary School Reading: A Report on Recent Research." ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, 1968. ED 024 560.

(14) Bowman, Betty Lynch. "A Comparison of Pupil Achievement and Attitude in a Graded School with Pupil Achievement and Attitude in a Nongraded School 1968-69, 1969-70 School Years." Dissertation Abstracts International 32 (August 1971): 660-A-661-A.

(24) Courtney, Brother Leonard. "The Rationale for Teaching Reading in the Content Fields." Paper presented at the Hofstra University Conference, October 30, 1970. ED 046 642.

(27) Dolan, Sister Mary Edward. "Secondary Developmental Reading Programs -- Are They Feasible?" Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, April 19-23. 1971. ED 054 911.

(50) Herber, Harold L. "Reading in Content Areas: A District Develops Its Own Personnel." Journal of Reading (May 1970): 587-92.

(58) Karlin, Robert. "Characteristics of Sound Remedial Reading Instruction." Journal of the Reading Specialist (May 1966): 165-69.

(65) Lichtman, Marilyn. "Keys to a Successful Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (April 1971): 652-58.

(88) Smith, George. "The Development of an Instrument to Record the Interaction Between Teacher and Pupil in the Classroom and the Correlation of Certain Factors with Achievement." Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971.

(95) Valett, Robert E. "Effective Teaching: A Guide to Diagnostic-Prescriptive Task Analysis." 1970. ED 044 849.

III. FACILITIES AND MATERIALS

1. *Supplementary Reading Materials.*

Appropriate supplementary reading materials to support the basic reading curriculum are provided and utilized.

The use of appropriate supplementary reading materials to support the basic reading curriculum was supported by the literature reviewed.

While the results concerning the increase in reading achievement that can be attributed to the use of supplementary materials varied, several conclusions can be drawn: (1) The use of supplementary materials enabled the teacher to better meet the individual needs of each child (Lichtman, Blakely and McKay, Fay); (2) Supplementary materials help to establish a positive attitude toward learning to read, an essential characteristic in any reading program (Calder, Anderson, Fader, Fay); (3) The supplementary materials need to be chosen by the teacher or generated by the school to best meet the needs of the students (Stanchfield, Fay, Fader); (4) The supplementary materials should reflect the students' ethnic background and interests (Stanchfield); (5) Supplementary materials should be utilized for students at all learning levels including the slow learner and the gifted (Bigaj, Quackenbush).

Results in student achievement varied when the attempt was made to link student achievement to the use of supplementary materials. Both Calder and Levine report that no significant difference in reading achievement was found with

(37) Fay, Leo C. and others. "Curriculum Guide in Reading. Developmental Reading, Grades 1-8." Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, 1966. ED 011 495.

(62) Levine, Daniel A. and others. "Report of the Westside Workshop on Teacher Training and Curriculum Adaptation in the Inner City. An Institute to Help Teachers Develop and Adapt Instructional Materials. . ." October 1967. ED 024 734.

(65) Lichtman, Marilyn. "Keys to a Successful Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (April 1971): 652-58.

(79) Otto, Henry J. and others. "Nongradedness: An Elementary School Evaluation." Bureau of Laboratory Schools Monograph No. 21, Texas University, 1969. ED 036 889.

(81) Quackenbush, Sylvia. "Creative Reading Activities for the Middle Grades." Paper presented at the conference of the International Reading Association, May 6-9, 1970. ED 045 312.

(86) Robinson, R. E. "First-Grade Reading Instruction." The Asheville City Schools, 1965-1966. ED 010 171.

(91) Stanchfield, Jo. M. "The Use of Original Instructional Materials as a Stimulus for Improved Reading." December 1966. ED 013 731.

(92) Stowe, Elaine. "A Departmentalized High School Reading Program." 1971. ED 055 750.

III. FACILITIES AND MATERIALS

2. *Materials Recognize Variations in Race, Culture, Sex.*
Materials are utilized which recognize different races, cultures, and sexes.

The limited literature reviewed supports this criterion. There has been much recent work focusing on the subject of this criterion that is not reported in this literature search, but the opinions reviewed seem to reflect a general trend.

Gold reflects the opinion of many when he points out that reading series have been criticized for their lack of masculine interests and their middle-class orientation. To counteract these deficiencies, many authors have written stories about lower class backgrounds and minority ethnic groups in recent years. Gold refers to the American Council on Education's *Reading Ladder for Human Relations* for a listing of some of these materials.

Stanchfield reported a study in which methods and materials were developed to determine their effect on first grade reading achievement. Intelligence, sex, home background, and ethnic origin were the factors considered. His findings seem to support the need for special materials that recognize different races, cultures and sexes.

Miller and Johnson review several studies which show increased interest and achievement on the part of Navajo students with the introduction of materials concerning their ethnic group and culture.

Another area of concern relating to this criterion is

the recognition of ethnic biases in children's literature. Articles by both Baxter and Bernstein point out problems and give suggestions for materials and ways of handling these materials in the classroom.

---

(6) Baxter, Catherine B. "Combating the Influence of Black Stereotypes in Children's Books." Reading Teacher (March 1974): 540-44.

(10) Bernstein, Joanne. "The Changing Roles of Females in Books for Young Children." The Reading Teacher (March 1974): 545-49.

(41) Gold. "Chapter 9, Language Arts for the Gifted Student." Education for the Intellectually Gifted, pp. 207-213.

(70) Miller, D. D. and Johnson, Gail. "What We've Learned About Teaching Reading to Navajo Indians." The Reading Teacher (March 1974): 550-54.

(91) Stanchfield, Jo. M. "The Use of Original Instructional Materials as a Stimulus for Improved Reading." December 1966. ED 013 731.

III. FACILITIES AND MATERIALS

3. *Supportive Media.*

A wide variety of supportive media on all levels of learning is available and readily accessible.

The literature search provided few studies relating to this criterion; however, most of the articles that described the characteristics of good reading programs stressed the necessity of having a wide variety of supportive media available and accessible. Several propositions were presented related to this criterion: (1) Supportive media, if used skillfully, helps to enhance the child's attitude for learning (Crawford and Conley, Fader, Quackenbush); (2) The specific location of the media was not as important as its accessibility to both teachers and students, (Lichtman); (3) The supportive media must be used to meet individual student needs (NJEA Review, Lichtman). The NCEC report shows an increase in both student achievement and motivation when a student-centered, integrated approach with supportive media is utilized.

Further information related to this criterion can also be found in criterion III 1 (Supplementary Reading Materials), a strongly supported criterion.

---

(25) Crawford, Gail and Conley, Dick. "Meet You in Reading Lab!" Journal of Reading (October 1971): 16-21.

(33) Fader, Daniel N. "English for Reluctant Learners, Grades 7-9, English in Every Classroom." University of Michigan, October 1966. ED 010 424.

(37) Fay, Leo C. and others. "Curriculum Guide in Reading Developmental Reading, Grades 1-8." Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, 1966. ED 011 495.

(56) "How Does Your Remedial Reading Stack Up?" NJEA Review (March 1970): 16-19.

(61) LaBudde, Constance and Smith, Richard J. "Librarians Look at Remedial Reading." The Reading Teacher (December 1973): 263-70.

(62) Levine, Daniel A. and others. "Report of the Westside Workshop on Teacher Training and Curriculum Adaptation in the Inner City. An Institute to Help Teachers Develop and Adopt Instructional Materials." October 1967. ED 024 734.

(65) Lichtman, Marilyn. "Keys to a Successful Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (April 1971): 652-58.

(76) NCEC. "Model Programs, Title III - Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Specialized Language Activities for the Rural Disadvantaged." South Paris, Maine, USGPO.

(81) Quackenbush, Sylvia. "Creative Reading Activities for the Middle Grades." Paper presented at the conference of the International Reading Association, May 6-9, 1970. ED 045 312.

(86) Robinson, R. E. "First-Grade Reading Instruction." The Asheville City Schools, 1965-1966. ED 010 171.

III. FACILITIES AND MATERIALS

4. *Central Location for Reading Materials.*

Instructional and practice reading materials are filed in a central location in each school for use by all teachers as needed.

Very little literature was found that directly related to this criterion. The concern for materials was typified by Lichtman's statement that materials could be located in one or a number of locations in the school. The only concern was that the materials be accessible to the teacher. McNeil suggested that a good reading program should be housed in a permanent room where all materials would be available. LaBudde contended that the librarian and remedial reading teacher should work together to help students improve their reading. She also indicated that the remedial reading teacher cannot stock the diversity of books in her classroom that are available in the media center. This seems to give support for the media center as a central location for materials.

---

(22) Clay, Rema. "Hub of the Instructional Program. A Casebook of Library Services." American Library 1 (February 1970).

(25) Crawford, Gail and Conley, Dick. "Meet You in Reading Lab!" Journal of Reading (October 1971): 16-21.

(32) "Facility Sharing Works for Washburne and Skokie Schools." American School and University 42 (April 1970): 38-39.

(44) Goodwin, Georgie J. "An Educational Tool for All. A Casebook of School Library Service." American Library 1 (February 1970): 164-65.

(61) LaBudde, Constance and Smith, Richard J. "Librarians Look at Remedial Reading." The Reading Teacher (December 1973): 263-70.

(65) Lichtman, Marilyn. "Keys to a Successful Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (April 1971): 652-58.

(68) McNeil, Shirley. "The Role of the Reading Coordinator." Great Cities School Improvement Program, Detroit, Michigan, February 1965. ED 001 005.

(73) "Model Programs: Reading. The Topeka Reading Clinic, Centers and Services, Topeka, Kansas." Palo Alto, California: American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, 1971. ED 053 888.

APPENDIX B:

Alphabetical Listing of the Literature

(1) Anderson, Jean M. "The Impact of Seven Word Games on the Sight Vocabulary Retention of First Grade Students." Dissertation Abstracts International (1971): 4478-A.

(2) Anderson, Richard C. "The Case for Nongraded Homogeneous Grouping." The Elementary School Journal (January 1962): 193-97.

(3) Artley, A. Sterl. "Secondary Developmental Reading Programs -- Are They Feasible?" Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, April 23, 1971. ED 053 871.

(4) Artley, A. Sterl. "The Reading Specialist Talks to the Public." The Reading Teacher (May 1965): 645-48.

(5) Artley, A. Sterl. "Trends and Practice in Secondary School Reading: A Report on Recent Research." ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, 1968. ED 024 560.

(6) Baxter, Catherine B. "Combating the Influence of Black Stereotypes in Children's Books." Reading Teacher (March 1974): 540-44.

(7) Beck, Isabel L. and Bolvin, John O. "A Model for Nongradedness: The Reading Program for Individually Prescribed Instruction." Pittsburgh University Learning Research and Development Center, 1969. ED 033 832.

(8) Beery, Althea. "Schools Report to Parents." The Reading Teacher (May 1965): 639-44.

(9) Beldin, H. O. "Teaching Diagnostic Techniques to Classroom Teachers." Paper presented at International Reading Association Conference, April 24-27, 1968. ED 022 629.

(10) Bernstein, Joanne. "The Changing Roles of Females in Books for Young Children." Reading Teacher (March 1974): 545-49.

(11) Bigaj, James J. "A Reading Program for Gifted Children in the Primary Grades." April 25, 1968. ED 020 086.

(12) Blakely, W. Paul and McKay, Beverly. "Individualized Reading as Part of an Eclectic Reading Program." Elementary English (March 1966): 214-19.

(13) Boercker, Marguerite and Ramsey, Wallace. "The Influence of a Head Start Program on Reading Achievement." May 1967. ED 012 685.

(14) Bowman, Betty Lynch. "A Comparison of Pupil Achievement and Attitude in a Graded School with Pupil Achievement and Attitude in a Nongraded School 1968-69, 1969-70 School Years." Dissertation Abstracts International 32 (August 1971): 660-61A.

(15) Braam, Leonard S. and Roehm, Marilyn A. "Subject Area Teachers' Familiarity with Reading Skills." Journal of Developmental Reading (1964): 188-96.

(16) Briscoe, Cecil D. "A Reading Program with Lay Aides and Programmed Material." The Clearinghouse (February 1969): 373-77.

(17) Brown, Edward K. "The Nongraded Program at the Powell Elementary School: Evaluative Phase II." Philadelphia School District, Pennsylvania, April 1970. ED 049 298.

(18) Brown, R. I. "A Remedial Reading Program for the Adolescent Illiterate." The Journal of Special Education, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 409-417.

(19) Buchanan, Anne and others. "Monitoring the Progress of the Group in an Individualized Reading Program Based on Behavioral Objectives." Paper presented at meeting of American Educational Research Association, February 4-7, 1971. ED 047 925.

(20) Calder, Clarence, Jr. "Self-directed Reading Materials." The Reading Teacher 21 (December 1967): 249-52.

(21) Chern, Nona. "In-service Education in Reading: The Realization of the Potential Symposium III." Paper presented at International Reading Associate's Conference, April 24-27, 1968. ED 028 020.

(22) Clay, Rema. "Hub of the Instructional Program. A Casebook of Library Services." American Library 1 (February 1970).

(23) Cotter, Katharine. "First-Grade Failure: Diagnosis, Treatment and Prevention." Childhood Education (November 1967): 172-76.

(24) Courtney, Brother Leonard. "The Rationale for Teaching Reading in the Content Fields." Paper presented at the Hofstra University Conference, October 30, 1970. ED 046 642.

(25) Crawford, Gail and Conley, Dick. "Meet You in Reading Lab!" Journal of Reading (October 1971): 16-21.

(26) Derenzis, Joseph J. "Individually Prescribed Instruction: Background Information and Research." Paper presented at the Meeting of the International Reading Association, April 19-23, 1971. ED 051 974.

(27) Dolan, Sister Mary Edward. "Secondary Developmental Reading Programs -- Are They Feasible?" Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, April 19-23, 1971. ED 054 911.

(28) Dramer, Dan. "Self-Contained Reading-Oriented Classes in Secondary Schools." Paper presented at the International Reading Association Conference, May 1970. ED 041 705.

(29) Elliott, Lee. "Montessori's Reading Principles Involving Sensitive Period Method Compared to Reading Principles of Contemporary Reading Specialists." The Reading Teacher 21 (November 1967): 163-68.

(30) Ellison, Mary Lou. "Compendium of Reading Materials and Teaching Techniques for the Wisconsin Protatypic System of Reading Instruction." Wisconsin University, February 1969. ED 039 105.

(31) Engel, Barney M. and Cooper, Martin. "Academic Achievement and Nongradedness." The Journal of Experimental Education 40 (Winter 1971).

(32) "Facility Sharing Works for Washburne and Skokie Schools." American School and University 42 (April 1970): 38-39.

(33) Fader, Daniel N. "English for Reluctant Learners, Grades 7-9, English in Every Classroom." University of Michigan, October 1966. ED 010 424.

(34) Farr, Roger. "Reading Diagnosis: Trends and Issues." Paper presented at the meeting of the Nassau Reading Council, Uniondale, New York, March 9, 1971. ED 050 899.

(35) Farr, Roger. "The Fallacies of Testing." Paper presented to the Conference on Reading and the National Interest, March 22-24, 1970. ED 040 020.

(36) Farr, Roger and Brown, Virginia L. "Evaluation and Decision Making." The Reading Teacher 24 (January 1971): 341-54.

(37) Fay, Leo C. and others. "Curriculum Guide in Reading. Developmental Reading, Grades 1-8." Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, 1966. ED 011 495.

(38) Fay, Leo C. "Curriculum Guide in Reading. Remedial Reading, Grades 3-12." Indiana State Department of Public Instruction, 1965. ED 011 496.

(39) Franseth. "Survey of Reading Research on Grouping." Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, OE 20089, pp. 19-20; 63-64.

(40) Geis, Robley. "A Preventive Summer Program for Kindergarten Children Likely to Fail in First Grade Reading, Final Report." La Canada Unified School District, California, July 1968. ED 030 495.

(41) Gold. "Chapter 9, Language Arts for the Gifted Student." Education for the Intellectually Gifted, pp. 207-213.

(42) Gold, Lawrence. "Preparing Classroom Teachers to Work with Severely Underachieving Pupils Through an Internship in a Regional Learning Disability Center." Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Statewide Reading Conference, Grossinger, New York, April 8-10, 1970. ED 040 829.

(43) Gomberg, Adeline. "The Lighthouse Day Camp Reading Experiment with Disadvantaged Children." The Reading Teacher (January 1966): 243-52.

(44) Goodwin, Georgie J. "An Educational Tool for All. A Casebook of School Library Service." American Library 2 (February 1970): 164-65.

(45) Greenshields, Charles M. "A Follow-up Study of Disadvantaged Children Who had Experienced Preschool Education." Child Study Research Center, State University College at Buffalo.

(46) Gumpper. "Nongraded Elementary Education: Individualized Learning -- Teacher Leadership -- Student Responsibility." University Park, Pa.: Institute for Research on Human Resources, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971. ED 057 440.

(47) Hammond, Robert L. "Accountability Through Context Evaluation of Reading Performance." Journal of Research and Development in Education (Fall 1971): 31-36.

(48) Harckham, Laura D. and Hogen, Lois V. "The Effects of a Phonics-Oriented Kindergarten Program on Auditory Discrimination and Reading Readiness." Paper presented at the Conference of the American Education Research Association, March 2-6, 1970. ED 040 834.

(49) Hatfield, Frances. "Individualized Learning in the Flexible School. A Casebook of School Library Services." American Library 1(February 1970): 169-70.

(50) Herber, Harold L. "Reading in Content Areas: A District Develops Its Own Personnel." Journal of Reading (May 1970): 587-92.

(51) Herber, Harold and Sanders, Peter, eds. "Research in Reading in the Content Areas: First Year Report." Syracuse University, Reading and Language Arts Center, 1969. ED 037 305.

(52) Hillerich, Robert. "An Interpretation of Research in Reading Readiness." April 1966. ED 011 484.

(53) Hillson, Maurice, J; Jones, Charles; Moore, J. William; and Van Devender, Frank. "A Controlled Experiment Evaluating the Effects of a Nongraded Organization on Pupil Achievement." The Journal of Educational Research 57 (July-August 1964): 548-50.

(54) Hodder, Velma and others. "A Position Paper on the Teaching of Reading, Developmental and Corrective." Nebraska State Department of Education, December 1965. ED 011 831.

(55) Hoppock, Anne. "Reading in the Kindergarten." New Jersey State Department of Education, March 1966.

(56) "How Does Your Remedial Reading Stack UP?" NJEA Review (March 1970): 16-19.

(57) Jones, Daisy Marvel. "Reading in the Content Areas, or This is Not the Same as Reading a Story." Paper presented at the meeting of the Keystone State Reading Association, October 29, 1970. ED 046 658.

(58) Karlin, Robert. "Characteristics of Sound Remedial Reading Instruction." Journal of the Reading Specialist (May 1966): 165-69.

(59) Kipling, Cecil. "An Optimum Reading Program for Grades K-12, and School District Organization." South Dakota University, November 1, 1967. ED 018 341.

(60) Klosterman, Sister Rita. "The Effectiveness of a Diagnostically Structured Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (November 1970): 159-67.

(61) LaBudde, Constance and Smith, Richard J. "Librarians Look at Remedial Reading." The Reading Teacher (December 1973): 263-70.

(62) Levine, Daniel A. and others. "Report of the Westside Workshop on Teacher Training and Curriculum Adaptation in the Inner City. An Institute to Help Teachers Develop and Adopt Instructional Materials." October 1967. ED 024 734.

(63) Lewis, Gertrude M. "Educating the More Able Pupils in Grades Four, Five, and Six." 1961. ED 001 233.

(64) Lewis, Ruth Christine. "A Study of the Results of the Brandonville Project in Nongraded Instruction." Dissertation Abstracts International (June 1971): 6472A.

(65) Lichtman, Marilyn. "Keys to a Successful Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (April 1971): 652-58.

(66) Lloyd, Helene M. "New York City's Program for Developing the Role of Parents in Reading Progress." The Reading Teacher (May 1965): 629-33.

(67) McMenemy, Richard A. "The Remedial [Reading] Teacher: Special Training and Professional Responsibilities." Paper presented at the meeting of the International Reading Association, April 19-23, 1971. ED 051 965.

(68) McNeil, Shirley. "The Role of the Reading Coordinator." Great Cities School Improvement Program, Detroit, Michigan, February 1965. ED 001 005.

(69) Meyer, Ronald E. "Reflections on Title III: Omaha Central Reading Clinic." Paper presented to the International Reading Association Conference, April 30-May 3, 1969. ED 033 837.

(70) Miller, D. D. and Johnson, Gail. "What We've Learned About Teaching Reading to Navajo Indians." Reading Teacher (March 1974): 550-54.

(71) "Minneapolis' Special School District Number 1, Minnesota, Teacher Aide Program, 1966-67." 1967. ED 024 643.

(72) "Model Programs: Reading, Elementary Reading Centers, Milwaukee, Wisconsin." Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences. ED 053 885.

(73) "Model Programs: Reading. The Topeka Reading Clinic, Centers and Services, Topeka, Kansas." Palo Alto, California: American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, 1971. ED 053 888.

(74) Moore, Walter J. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Reading in the Content Fields?" English Journal 58 (May 1969): 707-18.

(75) Morrill, Katherine A. "A Comparison of Two Methods of Reading Supervision." May 1966. ED 010 974.

(76) NCEC. "Model Programs, Title III - Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Specialized Language Activities for the Rural Disadvantaged." South Paris, Maine, USGPO.

(77) Newman, Robert E. "The Individualized Approach to Reading Instruction -- Key Concepts." May 1967. ED 017 396.

(78) Oakland Public Schools. "Report of Evaluation of Kindergarten Language Awareness Program at Stonehurst Elementary School." Oakland Interagency Project, 1964.

(79) Otto, Henry J. and others. "Nongradedness: An Elementary School Evaluation, Bureau of Laboratory School Monograph No. 21." Texas University, 1966. ED 036 889.

(80) Pennsylvania Department of Education. "A Six-Week Summer Remedial Reading Program." Project to Utilize Resources in Education, 1969.

(81) Quackenbush, Sylvia. "Creative Reading Activities for the Middle Grades." Paper presented at the conference of the International Reading Association, May 6-9, 1970. ED 045 312.

(82) Rauch, Sidney J. "How to Evaluate a Reading Program." The Reading Teacher 24 (December 1970): 244-50.

(83) Remacle, Leo. "A Comparative Study of the Differences in Attitudes, Self-Concept, and Achievement of Children in Graded and Non-graded Elementary Schools." Dissertation Abstracts International 31 (May 1971): 5948-A.

(84) Rentel, Victor M. "Ends and Means -- Developing Specific Objectives for Reading Instruction." May 1967. ED 015 089.

(85) Research and Information Service for Education (RISE). "RISE Bibliography on Behavioral Objectives/Reading K-6." May 1972.

(86) Robinson, R. E. "First-Grade Reading Instruction." The Asheville City Schools, 1965-1966. ED 010 171.

(87) Sanders, James R. "Considerations in Evaluating School Reading Programs." Viewpoints 48 (September): 15-25.

(88) Smith, George. "The Development of an Instrument to Record the Interaction Between Teacher and Pupil in the Classroom and the Correlation of Certain Factors with Achievement." Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971.

(89) Smith, Nila Banton, ed. "Reading Methods and Teacher Improvement." International Reading Association, 1971. ED 051 969.

(90) Smith, Richard J. "The Role of Reading Resource Teacher." Paper presented at the International Reading Association Conference, May 6-9, 1970. ED 042 578.

(91) Stanchfield, Jo. M. "The Use of Original Instructional Materials as a Stimulus for Improved Reading." December 1966. ED 013 731.

(92) Stowe, Elaine. "A Departmentalized High School Reading Program." 1971. ED 055 750.

(93) Summers. "Reading in the Secondary School." Review of Educational Research 27 (April 1967): 137-38.

(94) Tyau, Frances Siu Lan. "Campus Schools' Parent Reporting Procedures." Child Study Center Bulletin, State University College at Buffalo.

(95) Valett, Robert E. "Effective Teaching: A Guide to Diagnostic-Prescriptive Task Analysis." 1970. ED 044 849.

(96) Vogel, Francis X. and Bowers, Norman D. "The Relationship of Form of School Organization to Pupil Behavior." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, February 7, 1969. ED 028 503.

(97) Warterberg, Herbert; Hancley, Lilyan; and Locke, Maurice."Developing a Full-time Reading Center Within a Public School Setting." The Reading Teacher 24 (March 1971): 532-36, 560.

(98) Wilt, Hiram Jack. "A Comparison of Student Attitudes Toward School, Academic Achievement, Integral Structures and Procedures: The Nongraded School vs. The Graded School." Dissertation Abstracts International 31 (April 1971): 5105-A.

(99) Withall, John. "Evaluation of Classroom Climate." Childhood Education 45 (March 1969): 403-8.

APPENDIX C:

Alabama Right to Read Phase I School Systems

ALABAMA BOYS INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL

Mr. John Carr
Superintendent
Mrs. Edith Smith
Right to Read Director

BARBOUR COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Mr. William A. Edson
Superintendent
Mrs. Dottie McQueen
Right to Read Director

BIRMINGHAM CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Dr. Wilmer S. Cody
Superintendent
Mrs. Ruth Strong
Right to Read Director

CONECUH COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Mr. Wayne Pope
Superintendent
Mrs. Ola Mason
Right to Read Director

CULLMAN CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Dr. Arthur Dennis
Superintendent
Mrs. Fronia Moore
Right to Read Director

ELBA CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Mr. Elmer Taylor
Superintendent
Mrs. Addieleen Prescott
Right to Read Director

FRANKLIN COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Mr. Jimmy Clements
Superintendent
Mr. Chester Jacobs
Right to Read Director

HOMEWOOD CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Mr. Virgil Nunn
Superintendent
Mrs. Frances Thompson
Right to Read Director

HUNTSVILLE CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Dr. V. M. Burkett
Superintendent
Mrs. Mickey Riggins
Right to Read Director
Mrs. Saranel Detamore
Right to Read Director

MACON COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Mr. Ulysses Byas
Superintendent
Mrs. Ora Manning
Right to Read Director

MOBILE CATHOLIC DIOCESE

Rev. William B. Friend
Superintendent
Sister Mary Johanna Crabtree
Right to Read Director

MONTGOMERY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Dr. Silas Garrett
Superintendent
Mrs. Maggie Walker
Right to Read Director

RUSSELL COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Mr. Warren N. Richards
Superintendent
Mrs. Theoria King
Right to Read Director

TUSCALOOSA CITY SCHOOL SYSTEM

Dr. Hugh Stegall
Superintendent
Dr. Frances Anderson
Right to Read Director